NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06820096 7

The
Gordon Lester Ford
Collection
Presented by his Sons
Worthington Chauncey Ford
and
Paul Leicester Ford
to the
New York Public Library

ANNEX

THE NEW
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

Engd by G.H.E. Fennell, N.Y.

D. M. Bennett.

THE

Champions of the Church:

THEIR CRIMES AND PERSECUTIONS.

By D. M. BENNETT,

Editor of "The Truth Seeker," author of "The World's Sages, Thinkers, and Reformers," "Thirty Discussions, Bible Stories, Essays, and Lectures," "Interrogatories to Jehovah," "What I Don't Believe; What I Do Believe: Why and Wherefore," and joint author of "Christianity and Infidelity—the Humphrey-Bennett Discussion," "The Bennett-Teed Discussion," etc., etc., etc.

NEW YORK:
D. M. BENNETT,
LIBERAL AND SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING HOUSE.
SCIENCE HALL, 141 EIGHTH STREET.
1878.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
16185
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
1899.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Admissions against the Scriptures	108
Adrian IV.	330
Alexander VI.	528
Alexander VII.	922
Alva, Duke of	692
Anthony, St.	186
Anthony Comstock	1009
Antipopes	451
Athanasius	222
Augustine, St.	246
Benedict IX.	327
Boniface III.	278
Boniface VII.	323
Boniface VIII.	396
Calvin, John	578
Callistus	229
Catherine de Medici	730
Charlemagne	288
Charles V.	657
Christian Admissions against the Scriptures,	108
Christianity always was Intolerant	106
Christianity and Slavery	946
Christians, Moral Character of Early	103
Clement of Rome	135
Clement VI.	426
Clergymen, Sinful	962
Clovis	259
Communist, Jesus was a	49
Compromise, Peter and the Great	89
Comstock, Anthony	1009
Concluding Remarks	1106
Constantine the Great	193
Corruptions of the Early Church	125
Cortez, Hernando	635
Council of Constance	474
Counter-popes	451
Crusades	377
Cyril, St.	235
Deity of Jesus	38
De Medici, Catherine	730
Dioscorus	243
Dominic, St.	344
Duke of Alva	692
Duty of Submission to Wrong Taught by Jesus	50
Early Christians, Moral Character of	103
Early Church, its Corruptions	125
Elizabeth, Queen	740
Eusebius	206
Evangelists, The Four	93
Evidences that all the Gospels had but one Source	98
Eye-witnesses, The Writers do not Claim to be	98
Ferdinand and Isabella	517
Francisco Pizarro	651
Gospels had only one Source	98

	PAGE.
GREGORY THE GREAT	271
GREGORY VII.	330
GREGORY XIII.	758
HENRY VIII.	627
HERMIT, PETER THE	377
HERNANDO CORTEZ	635
HOPKINS, MATTHEW	796
IGNATIUS	137
INNOCENT III.	359
INNOCENT IV.	369
INNOCENT VI.	437
INNOCENT X.	917
INTOLERANT, CHRISTIANITY ALWAYS WAS	106
IRENÆUS	162
IRENE	281
ISABELLA, FERDINAND AND	517
JAMES I.	796
JAMES II.	898
JESUISM, PAULINISM *vs.*	119
JESUISM, PROGRESS OF	84
JESUITS, LOYOLA AND THE	608
JESUS	25
JESUS AND JESUISM	64
JESUS, DEITY OF	38
JESUS DOES NOT RESPECT THE RIGHTS OF PROPERTY	45
JESUS EXHIBITS AN IMPERFECT SENSE OF JUSTICE	52
JESUS, MIRACLES OF	35
JESUS, MORAL TEACHINGS OF	39
JESUS PROFESSES TO PARDON SIN	51
JESUS TEACHES THE DUTY OF SUBMISSION TO WRONG	50
JESUS WAS A COMMUNIST	49
JOAN, POPESS	297
JOHN CALVIN	578
JOHN KNOX	710
JOHN XI.	315
JOHN XII.	318
JOHN XIII.	321
JOHN XXII.	413
JOHN XXIII.	474
JULIUS III.	751
JUSTIN MARTYR	145
KNOX, JOHN	710
LIGUORI, ST.	927
LOUIS XIV.	910
LOYOLA AND THE JESUITS	608
LUTHER, MARTIN	547
MAROZIA	311
MARTIN LUTHER	547
MARTIN V.	490
MARTYR, JUSTIN	145
MARY OF ENGLAND	723
MATTHEW HOPKINS	796
MIRACLES OF JESUS	35
MONTFORT, SIMON DE	364
MORAL CHARACTER OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS	103
MORAL TEACHINGS OF JESUS	39
MUNZER, THOMAS	720
NICHOLAS I.	305
ORIGEN	177
PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS	155
PASCHAL I.	294
PAUL	110
PAUL THE HERMIT, ST.	188
PAUL II.	503
PAUL V.	779
PAULINISM *vs.* JESUISM	119
PEPIN	284
PERSECUTION OF WITCHES	782
PETER AND THE GREAT COMPROMISE	89
PETER THE HERMIT	377
PHILIP II.	671
PIUS IV.	753
PIUS V.	756
PIUS VI.	934
PIZARRO, FRANCISCO	651
POLYCARP	149

	PAGE.
Popess Joan	297
Progress of Jesuism	84
Protestant Persecutions	832
Queen Elizabeth	740
Recapitulation	1092
Simeon Stylites	253
Simon de Montfort	364
Sinful Clergymen	962
Siricus	239
Sixtus	264
Sixtus V.	762
Stephen I.	190
St. Anthony	186
St. Augustine	246
St. Cyril	235
St. Dominic	344
St. Liguori	927
St. Paul	110
St. Paul the Hermit	188
St. Ursula	461
St. Victor	181
Tertullian	169
The Early Church, its Corruptions	125
The Four Evangelists	93
Theodosius	231
The Progress of Jesuism	84
Thomas Munzer	720
Torquemada	508
Urban VI.	442
Urban VIII.	893
Ursula	461
Victor, St.	181
Virgilius	266
Vacancies	451
Witches, Persecution of	782
Writers of the Gospels	98

INTRODUCTION.

THIS volume is largely a compilation from standard authorities, and consequently but little claim is set up for originality. Accuracy has been the object in view, and it has been the aim to strictly follow history, and very few except Christian authorities have been resorted to. A moiety only of the characters who have made themselves conspicuous by their crimes and persecutions have been named; had all been given with the details connected with their inglorious careers, a score of volumes the size of this would have scarcely contained the recitals. The more striking cases have been selected.

A few of these sketches were written some months before the work was taken in hand in earnest, but the greater portion has been produced in a little over three months' time. This, with editorial duties (which are not slight), an extensive correspondence, together with numerous other claims upon the writer's attention, has necessitated assistance. The names of the assistants are in some cases appended to the sketches written by them, and thanks for their aid are due. The services of our assistant, S. H. Preston, who has aided us largely in the work, we gratefully acknowledge. W. S. Bell contributed the article on "Jesus" and that on the "Four Evangelists." Others have aided us in a lesser degree, and to all, thanks are extended.

The main purpose of this volume has been to give, briefly and succinctly, an authentic history of the cruelties and persecutions practiced by distinguished leaders of the Christian Church in the past sixteen centuries. Nothing has been exaggerated; all is given as found in the most reliable authori-

ties. The first few articles are written, not with a view of proving the subjects to have been cruel or bloodthirsty, but rather to show the unreliable nature of the statements made in reference to them. It is unfortunate for Christianity that her reputed founders and leaders rest under such a cloud of mysticism and uncertainty. It is to be hoped the initial chapters will be studied with interest.

Before entering upon a consideration of the founders and champions of Christianity, it will be well, perhaps, to briefly examine the nature of religion, and whence the probable origin of Christianity.

There was a time when the present race of man was without literature and without arts, without civilization and without religion. At that early period man was but a slight remove above the animal, from which, in long courses of ages, he had probably evolved. He was without knowledge, without skill, without a language, and with but little intelligence. He lived in caves and holes in the ground, and associated on terms of more or less equality with the wild beasts that surrounded him With these animals he struggled for subsistence, fleeing from those stronger than himself, and pursuing and capturing for his own food those that were weaker, or those over which, by superior cunning, he was able to prevail.

From this crude, primitive condition man emerged very slowly. He was compelled to seek for food, and to protect himself from the extremes of heat and cold which alternately oppressed him. Having a brain slightly superior to the lower animals, he gradually obtained a mastery over them. He was able to fashion from stones, the limbs of trees, and the bones of animals such crude implements as he needed to slay the beasts he required for food, and ultimately to dig a little in the ground to plant such seeds as, in time, he learned were useful to sustain life.

The language used by man at that early period was doubtless crude and imperfect in character, consisting of but few words or sounds, which served to convey to his fellow-beings

the meagre ideas he had to impart. As the race spread over the surface of the earth, and became more developed in other respects, its language and its intelligence improved, and new dialects gradually came into use in different localities.

At the time when man was but a trifle above the brutes, he had no religion, but as he gradually emerged from that condition, and his intelligence and language were developed in a sparing degree, he began to have some religious ideas, though crude and rudimentary. In his primitive ignorance all his ideas were of the crudest character. This stage is called *Fetishism.* Man saw in the clouds, in the winds, in the tempest, in the lightning, in the thunder, in the ocean, in the rivers and streams, in the burning sun of summer and the frosts of winter, in the superior animals, in the growing forests, and in everything that possessed life and motion, powers and capabilities of ministering to his pleasures or his pain, and all these in his infantile imagination he invested with good or bad demons as the case might be. Everything that added to his pleasure was the work of good demons and everything that caused him pain or discomfort was caused by the bad demons. And here was the origin of gods and devils in the human imagination.

The fetish-worshiper thus had innumerable gods and demons, of greater or lesser power, as they contributed to his pleasure or pain. Many varieties of animals, plants, and trees he invested with invisible power, and held them as gods whom he could influence and placate by adoration and sacrifice. He regarded them not as symbols or representatives of invisible powers merely, but crudely imagined them to be absolute gods. Thus his deities were almost without number, and they were often so portable that he carried them around with him. Dogs, cats, horses, cattle, sheep, crocodiles, snakes, lizards, toads, birds, fishes, trees, plants, and crudely shaped blocks of wood and stone, served ignorant man for gods; and how to placate them and secure their good influences in his behalf was a source of great anxiety. As he had more pain than pleasure, as the ills that befell him were a greater

source of dread than all else besides, he readily learned to fear his gods more than to love them. Thus fear was the parent of religion and worship. How to placate his gods and keep them well disposed towards him taxed his ingenuity to the utmost. And thus it has been down to the present time. The gods have caused man a great amount of trouble. To secure their services and to keep them well disposed towards him have been the greatest care of his life. But for the gods his existence would have been vastly happier than it has been.

Among the most ancient forms of worship practiced by man was the worship of the sexual organs. There he found the source of life, and thither he directed his worship and adoration. This was not done in a spirit of sensuality, as might be supposed, but with a considerable degree of religious fervor. Phallic worship was practiced in different countries and by different nationalities, and was doubtless the basis, in part at least, of subsequent systems of worship. In Phallicism is found the origin of the symbol of the *cross*, which so many millions have profoundly venerated. Here is found the model for the *steeples* and the *round towers*, so long held sacred as objects of veneration.

As man progressed in intelligence, in some countries especially, the heavenly bodies were objects of worship, and were deities the people greatly revered. The sun, moon, and stars were worshiped as gods, and temples and altars were erected to them upon the tops of mountains, and thither the pious devotees often betook themselves to make sacrifices and to offer up oblations, praise, and prayer. The hymns and invocations with which they addressed the sun were sublime and eloquent. They revered the sun as the source of life and power, the greatest friend to man, and he was worshiped as the greatest deity of all. This was indeed a grand system of worship, and far more elevating than that of Fetishism which had previously prevailed among cruder races. The Chaldeans or ancient Persians were among the most conspicuous of sun-worshipers, and the Egyptians and other nations employed sun-worship largely. In fact, that system

of worship entered greatly into most of the ancient religions.

In addition to the worship of the sun and the heavenly bodies, the ancient Persians paid great admiration to their principal deity, Ormuzd, the god of light. Ahrimanes, his brother, was the god of darkness or evil, who was ever contending with his brother, the good deity. Their contests were severe and protracted, and each had a large concourse of spirits or angels in his employ, who took part respectively under the power they served. The good angels were called *izeds*, and the bad ones, *devas* and *arch-devas*. Zoroaster was a great prophet and reformer, in this system of religion, and he is credited with many grand and beautiful utterances on the subject of morals and a good life. He lived nearly a thousand years before the Christian era. There is a disagreement among authorities as to the time when he lived, some claiming that he lived about the time of Moses, while some placed him earlier in the world's history, and others later. The extravagant claim was made, even in olden times, that he lived five thousand years before the time of Plato. That is probably an error; but that his era was far, far back in the ages of the past there can be no question.

The religion of the Hindoos is probably still more ancient than that of the Chaldeans or Persians. It descended from the ancient Aryan race which peopled central and southern Asia. The literature, the history, and the theology of India were sealed books to the rest of the modern world until enterprising Europeans went there. Some of them remained years, and by patient investigation and exploration learned much of the literature and religion of that ancient people, and others studied the Oriental languages at home. Prominent among this studious class stand Sir William Jones, Sir Godfrey Higgins, Burnouf, Sir Cockburn Thompson, Jacolliot, Max Müller, Wilson, Bunsen, Schlegel, Spiegel, Legge, and others.

Those of this number who visited India made the acquaintance of learned Brahmins, and, by their aid, were ena-

bled to study the ancient Sanskrit language, which was employed thousands of years ago, and in which the sacred writings of that country were written. Those writings were found to be more voluminous and more ancient than the Jewish Scriptures, and consisted of hymns, invocations, lessons, dialogues, etc., embracing much that is sublime, elevated, and spiritual. They were written long before the Jewish Scriptures were penned, and even before the Hebrew nation had an existence. The Vedas, the Puranas, the Shastas, the Mahabarata, the Bhagavad-Gita, and other extensive writings, make up the Hindoo Scriptures, and in the aggregate embrace thousands of volumes, great numbers of which have never yet been translated into English.

In the theology of India is found much that is metaphysical, much that is abstruse, much of mystery, much that is lofty and elevated, much that is grand and poetic, and also much that is obscure and much that is absurd. Here is found the material that has proved a sufficient basis upon which to build subsequent systems of theology. Here is the source of nearly all the dogmas, rites, sacraments, symbols, and sacred observances which have been woven into more modern systems of religion. Here is found the original doctrine of the Trinity, which, in the last eighteen centuries, has been such an important item in Christian theology. Here is found the doctrine that gods cohabit with mortal virgins and produce a progeny half divine and half human. The most noted of these demigods or incarnations of Vishnu, a principal deity of the Hindoos, was Christna, whose advent into the world was placed from five hundred to one thousand years before our present era. The people loved him for his mildness and goodness, for the excellence of his teachings, and the lovely disposition he always displayed. It is claimed of him that he had many followers and disciples, that he performed many miracles, and that finally he was crucified on the banks of the Ganges. The similarity between the Indian demigod and the Judean demigod, who, it is claimed, figured much later in Palestine, is most marked.

One only could have been the original. The copy was certainly not the one who came first or who was believed in first.

India was indeed the cradle of the literature and religion of the world, and from that ancient country, thousands of years ago, spread over various countries the peculiarities of her learning and her theology. Many of the old religions seem to have imbibed the distinguishing qualities of her system, and to this general rule Christianity is certainly no exception.

It may safely be decided that all religions are of human origin, and that all past and existing systems are more or less modifications of the primitive system. All these systems have been claimed to be of divine origin, but every one lacks proofs of an origin above the human mind. There is certainly nothing in any of the systems that the intellect of man is incapable of conceiving, and nothing in the later system not found in the older ones.

It is not necessary here to consider the religions of Egypt, China, Thibet, Japan, Siam, Phœnicia, Syria, Greece, Rome, or Scandinavia. In all are found points of distinction and certainly of similarity. Older than Christianity existed Fetishism, Polytheism, Monotheism, and Judaism. Distinct traces of all of these systems are unmistakably found in the Christian system. Indeed, there is not a dogma, not a rite, not a sacrament in the Christian creed that is not found in one or more of the older systems. Its God and its Bible are Jewish, and the most of its rites and dogmas are decidedly pagan. It is nothing more nor less than a composite affair, made up of the systems and traditions that were a thousand years older.

If the candid reader will examine one by one the different dogmas and rites of the Christian scheme, he will find that they were all believed in several centuries before the birth of Christianity. Let us see. The fundamental dogma of the Christian faith was the begetting of Jesus, by God or the Holy Ghost, on the person of a Jewish maiden. This was only a renewal of a pagan idea that had existed for fully ten centuries before the dawn of Christianity, and was a part

of the religious traditions of nearly every ancient country. The story of the "virgin and child" is one of the oldest figments of the human mind, and was often symbolized in stone in the ancient temples. To show the lack of originality on the part of Christians in regard to the virgin mother of God, it is only necessary to quote a few of the terms used in the Hindoo, Egyptian, and Christian systems, as follows:

HINDOO,	EGYPTIAN.	CHRISTIAN.
Litany of our Lady Nari: Virgin.	Litany of our Lady Isis: Virgin.	Litany of our Lady of Loretto: Virgin.
1. Holy Nari—Mariama, Mother of perpetual fecundity.	1. Holy Isis, universal Mother—Muth.	1. Holy Mary, Mother of Divine Grace.
2. Mother of an incarnated God—Vishnu (Devanaguy).	2. Mother of Gods—Athyr.	2. Mother of God.
3. Mother of Christna.	3. Mother of Horus.	3. Mother of Christ.
4. Eternal Virginity—Kanyabava.	4. Virgo generatrix—Neith.	4. Virgin of Virgins.
5. Mother—Pure Essence, Akasa.	5. Mother-soul of the universe—Anouki.	5. Mother of Divine Grace.
6. Virgin most chaste, Kanya.	6. Virgin, sacred earth, —Isis.	6. Virgin most chaste.
7. Mother Taumatra, of the five virtues or elements.	7. Mother of all the virtues — Themi, with the same qualities.	7. Mother most pure. Mother undefiled. Mother inviolate. Mother most amiable. Mother most admirable.
8. Virgin Trigana, of the three elements, power or richness, love, and mercy.	8. Illustrious Isis, most powerful, merciful, just (Book of the Dead).	8. Virgin most powerful. Virgin most merciful. Virgin most faithful.
9. Mirror of Supreme Conscience—Abancara.	9. Mirror of justice and truth—Themei.	9. Mirror of Justice.
10. Wise Mother—Saraswati.	10. Mysterious mother of the world—Buto (secret wisdom).	10. Seat of Wisdom.
11. Womb of gold—Hyrania.	11. Sistrum of gold.	11. House of Gold.

12. Queen of Heaven.	12. Queen of Heaven and of the universe—Sati.	12. Queen of Heaven.
13. Devanaguy is conceiv'd without sin and immaculate herself.	13. Isis is a Virgin mother.	13. Mary conceived without sin.

Among the traditions of a virgin mother and child in pagan mythology a few may be mentioned:

1. Devanaguy, virgin mother of Christna.
2. Ceres, the virgin mother of Osiris, of whom it was claimed that he was begotten by "the father of all the gods."
3. Isis, the virgin mother of Horus the Redeemer.
4. Maia, virgin mother of the Redeemer, Sakia Muni.
5. The virgin Alcmene, mother of the Redeemer Alcides.
6. Ishtar, the revered and God-impregnated virgin mother of Babylon.
7. Celestine, virgin mother of Zulis.
8. Chimalman, virgin mother of Quexalcote.
9. Mayence, virgin mother of Hesus.
10. Semele, virgin mother of the Egyptian Bacchus.
11. Minerva, mother of the Grecian Bacchus.
12. Shing-Mong, virgin mother of the Savior Yu.
13. Myrrha, virgin mother of Adonis.
14. Coronis, virgin mother of Æsculapius.
15. Ri, the virgin mother of the Assyrian demigod.
16. Io, virgin mother of an ancient demigod.
17. Latonia, the virgin mother of Apollo.
18. Prudence, mother of Hercules.
19. Somnus, the mother of Momus.
20. Ops, the mother of Saturn.
21. Ida, the mother of Jupiter, Neptune, Juno, and others.
22. Maia, the mother of Mercury.
23. Juno, the mother of Mars, Vulcan, and Hebe.
24. Hecate, the mother of Janus.
25. Amphitrite, the mother of Triton.
26. Alimede, mother of Jason or Thesus.
27. Penelope, the mother of Pan.

28. Antiope, the mother of Amphion.
29. Mnemosyne, the mother of the nine Muses.
30. Clymene, the mother of Phæton.
31. Phœbe, the mother of Latonia.
32. Thetes, the mother of Achilles.
33. Calliope, the mother of Orpheus.

A majority of these mothers of gods or demigods were held to be virgins, and it was claimed that the fathers were gods, so of course the begetting was miraculous and by supernatural power. These embrace but a minor portion of the cases of cohabitation between gods on the one hand and goddesses and virgins on the other. Every case here given is of much older date than that of Jesus, the son of Jehovah and the Virgin Mary. If they are only myths, it is quite safe to say they were as real as that of Jesus. Those rest upon mythological legends and this upon a reputed dream. The reader is doubtless competent to decide whether the last of all the cases of god-begetting is the original or whether it is the copy or plagiarism.

The idea or dogma of a savior or redeemer to save the world from destruction is one that the world has believed as far back as history extends. Every religion and every nation has had its redeemer, and these have been worshiped as the saviors of mankind. The following list embraces a portion of them:

1. Christna, of Hindostan.
2. Buddha, of India.
3. Mithra, of Persia.
4. Crite, of Chaldea.
5. Baal and Taut, of Phœnicia.
6. Thammuz, of Syria.
7. Fohi and Tien, of China.
8. Zulis, of Egypt.
9. Indra, of Thibet.
10. Devatat, of Siam.
11. Adad, of Assyria.
23. Hill and Feta, of the Mandaites.
24. Universal Monarch, of the Sibyls.
25. Ischy, of Formosa.
26. Pythagoras, of Samos.
27. The Holy One, of Xaca.
28. Divine Teacher, of Plato.
29. Adonis, of Greece.
30. Alcestos, of Euripides.
31. Hercules, son of God and Alcmene.

12. Prometheus, of Caucasius.
13. Æsculapius, of Egypt and Greece.
14. Wittoba, of Telingonese.
15. Xamolxis, of Thrace.
16. Zoor, of the Bonzes.
17. Atys, of Phrygia.
18. Bali, of Afghanistan.
19. Iao, of Nepaul.
20. Mikado, of the Sintoos.
21. Beddru, of Japan.
22. Cadmus, of Greece.
32. Apollo, son of Isis.
33. Hesus and Bremrillah, of the Druids.
34. Odin, of Scandinavia.
35. Alcides, of Thebes.
36. Thor, son of Odin of the Gauls.
37. Salivahand, of Bermuda.
38. Gentaut and Quexalcote, of Mexico
39. Ixion, of Rome.
40. Quirinius, of Rome.

These were all a long time prior to the advent of Jesus of Galilee.

The legends of these saviors or sons of God being crucified as an atonement or expiation for the sins of mankind is also very ancient—far older than the story of Jesus. A portion of them will be here enumerated:

1. Christna, the son of the god Vishnu, crucified upon a tree upon the banks of the Ganges.

2. Sakia Muni, claimed by his followers to have been crucified upon a cross.

3. Thammuz, of Syria, nearly twelve hundred years before Christ. His expiation upon the cross was commemorated in verse, thus:

> "Trust, ye saints, your Lord restored;
> Trust ye in your risen Lord:
> For the pains which Thammuz endured,
> Our salvation has procured."

4. Wittoba, of the Telingonese, crucified 552 B. C.
5. Iao, of Nepaul, crucified 622 B. C.
6. Hesus, of the Celtic Druids, crucified 834 B. C.
7. Quexalcote, of Mexico, crucified 587 B. C.
8. Quirinius, of Rome, crucified 506 B. C.
9. Prometheus, crucified 547 B. C.

The Grecian poet, Æschylus, wrote a drama in which Pro-

metheus, for his love to mortals, and to appease the anger of the gods, was crucified on an upright beam of timber, to which he was nailed (or, as some writers have changed it, he was fastened to cliffs of rocks), and this five hundred years before the story of Jesus. The poet, in portraying the propitiatory offering of Prometheus, says:

"Lo! streaming from the fatal tree,
His all-atoning blood,
Is this the infinite? Yes 'tis he,
Prometheus, and a God.

"Will night the sun in darkness hide,
And veil his glories in,
When God, the great Prometheus, died
For man, the creature's, sin."

The new American Cyclopedia (vol. i, p. 157) contains this emphatic declaration relative to this sin-atoning oriental savior: "It is doubtful whether there is to be found in the whole range of Greek letters deeper pathos than that of the divine war of the beneficent demigod Prometheus, crucified on his Scythian crags for his love to mortals." The only discrepancy in the way the story is told is whether he was crucified on a tree or a beam of timber or upon the rocks: but in the older versions, as that ascribed to Hesiod, as given by Seneca and others of the ancient writers, it is stated that he was nailed to an upright beam of timber to which were affixed extended arms of wood, and that this cross was situated near the Caspian straits. The more modern story of the rocks is thought to have been a Christian modification to break the close similarity between the story of Prometheus and that of Jesus. But it is asserted by Sir Godfrey Higgins that the later version is an impious Christian fraud, "for," says this eminent and learned historian, "I have seen the account which declares that he was nailed to a cross with hammer and nails (Anac, vol. i, p. 327).

In Lampriere's Classical Dictionary and in Higgins' Anacalypsis may be found these particulars relative to the crucifixion of this demigod:

"That the whole framework of nature became convulsed. That the earth shook, the rocks were rent, the graves were opened, and in a storm, which threatened the dissolution of the universe, the solemn scene forever closed and 'our Lord and Savior,' Prometheus, gave up the ghost. 'The cause for which he suffered was his love for the human race.'"

Let the reader again decide whether the story of Prometheus was borrowed from that of Jesus, who lived more than five hundred years later, or whether the latter was made up from the former. If the Christian system is divine, if it was devised by the great king of heaven, it would seem that it should have been at least original and not a copy or plagiarism of the old pagan legends that had been in existence a thousand years before. Is it possible that God was under the necessity of following the inventions of pagan mythologists? Is it not more probable that the early fathers and founders of the Christian system formulated it from the material they had before them?

10. Zulis, of Egypt, crucified 1700 B. C.
11. Indra, of Thibet, crucified 725 B. C.
12. Alcestos, of Euripides, crucified 600 B. C.
13. Atys, of Phrygia, crucified 1170 B. C.
14. Crite, of Chaldea, crucified 1200 B. C.
15. Bali, of Afghanistan, crucified 725 B. C.
16. Mithra, of Persia, crucified 600 B. C.
17. Devatat, of Siam, crucified 800 B. C.
18. Ixion, of Rome, crucified 400 B. C.
19. Apollonius, of Tyana, in Cappadocia, born a few years before the reputed birth of Jesus and died the death of the cross.
20. Jesus of Judea, crucified for the sins of the world, completes the score of crucified saviors. It is not to be supposed that these twenty characters all had a real existence, or even that there is more proof of one than of another, but this part is perfectly clear: the legend and tradition of a crucified god or demigod, put to death in that ignominious manner as an atonement or propitiation for the sins of mankind, was held

and promulgated by nearly all the ancient religions more than one thousand years before Christianity was known in the world; and the only rational conclusion to come to is that the founders of the newer system of Christianity had these facts before them and utilized them in perfecting the new religion.

It may be repeated that Christians will stoutly assert that the more ancient demigods were myths, and myths only, but unfortunately they cannot successfully clear their own demigod from the same charge. His existence rests only upon the uncorroborated and contradictory statements of four anonymous writers who are claimed to have lived in the time of the Christian demigod, but whose gospels were unknown, and undoubtedly had no existence for nearly two hundred years after the narrated events were said to have transpired. In the second Christian century there was a report, said to have been made by Irenæus upon the authority of Polycarp, who claimed to have gotten it from St. John, that Jesus was not crucified at all, and that he lived to be fifty years old and died a natural death. When it is considered how religions have been formulated in the past; how they have in all cases been made up of preëxisting systems and traditions, the source of the Christian religion need not be a matter of much doubt.

That the traditions, rites, ceremonies, and dogmas of Christianity were copied or purloined from older religious systems, is easily seen:

1. The birth of many of the saviors of the ancients were claimed to have been pointed out by the stars.

2. Several of them were said to have been born in a stable and in a manger.

3. The birth of a number of them was announced by angels to shepherds.

4. Wise men or magi were claimed to have visited them in their early infancy, and to have worshiped them and made them presents.

5. The twenty-fifth of December was the birthday desig-

nated for several of them, and has been a special day for feasts and ceremonies in commemoration and in honor of the sons of gods for thousands of years.

6. The titles of the heathen saviors were much like those claimed for the Judean savior. "The Most High," "The Lord of Life," "Holy Living God," "Son of God," "Mediator," "Savior," "Redeemer," "Redeemer of the World," "The Lamb of God," "The Ram of God," "The Holy Lamb," "The True Light," "The Son of Righteousness," "True Light of the World," "Light of Men," "Guide to the Erring," "Advocate with the Father," are some among the great number of titles given to the pagan saviors.

7. The legend of the savior being saved from destruction when all the other infants were killed—as in the time of Herod—was handed down from centuries before that date.

8. The retirement and forty days' fasting of the savior is an ancient heathen legend.

9. The performance of miracles was attributed to nearly all the saviors, and greatly dwelt upon. Several raised the dead.

10. The older saviors had disciples, whom they led about over the country, whom they taught, and whose feet they washed.

11. They taught multitudes in the villages, on the highways, in the fields, and in the wilderness.

12. At the crucifixion of some of them, the sun was said to have been darkened and earthquakes to have taken place.

13. Several of the demigods were said to have descended into hell after their crucifixion.

14. The claim that they arose from the dead, from the grave, and from the sepulchre was accorded to a number of them.

15. The miraculous ascension into heaven was claimed for a part, at least, of the oriental saviors.

16. The doctrine of the Trinity is a thousand years older than Christianity.

17. The Holy Ghost idea came from India, and is abundantly taught in the Hindoo theology.

18. The belief in a devil originated in heathen lands, and was elaborately taught in the Hindoo, Persian, and Egyptian religions.

19. The cross, as a religious symbol, was used hundreds of years before Christ, in India, Thibet, Egypt, and other countries. Nothing is better authenticated than this.

20. Immortality of the soul was first taught by pagans. The Jews did not believe in it, but the pagans did.

21. The personalized idea of the "Word," or "Logos," the Creator, as used by St. John, was of oriental origin.

22. Baptism by water was early practiced in India and Persia.

23. The Holy Ghost descending in the form of a dove, is an ancient Eastern legend.

24. The sacrament of the *Eucharist* came from the pagans.

25. Anointing with oil was practiced from time immemorial.

26. The worship of demigods, as already seen, was of heathen origin.

27. Belief in saints and reverence for them date back many centuries before Christianity.

28. The doctrine of future rewards and punishments was first taught by pagans.

29. The belief in a great and final day of judgment originated in heathen countries.

30. The belief in the resurrection of the dead is much older than Christianity.

31. The belief in angels and spirits was held by many pagan nations thousands of years ago.

32. Fasting and prayer were of eastern and pagan origin.

33. The power to forgive sin was taught by heathens.

34. The belief that bibles are the word of God existed in many pagan countries, several of which have bibles older and larger than the Jewish book.

35. The "second birth" was first taught in heathendom.

36. Confession and absolution from sin are of pagan origin.

37. Monasteries and monks existed in Central Asia hundreds of years before the era of Christianity.

38. The order of the priesthood long existed in all pagan countries.

39. Repentance and humility were enjoined by the ancients.

40. The efficacy of prayer directed to the gods was early taught in all heathen lands.

The most positive proofs can be given that every proposition here made is strictly true, but it is not deemed necessary to take the space to demonstrate it at length. If the reader will refer to Sir Godfrey Higgins' "Anacalypsis," Sir William Jones' "Asiatic Researches," Johnson's "Oriental Religions," Taylor's "Diegesis" and "Syntagma," Mrs. Child's "Progress of Religious Ideas," Jacolliot's "Bible in India," Dupuis' "Origin of all Religious Worship," Graves' "Sixteen Crucified Saviors," Blavatsky's "Isis Unveiled," etc., he will find all the proofs on these subjects that he can possibly desire.

In view of the fact that the entire system of Christianity was copied, borrowed, and appropriated from preëxisting systems, we are led to wonder at the dearth and sterility of the minds of its founders in the line of originality and invention. It would seem that an ordinary intelligence would have been able to originate at least a few new ideas. If we take from Christianity all that was borrowed from heathen lands, there is literally nothing left, save its cruel persecutions and horrible bloodshed, which it seems its founders did not borrow from heathen nations, and in which, alone, their originality and invention were displayed.

The claim of superiority of the worshipers of Jesus is based upon the transcendent quality of his moral teachings, that he enunciated a code of moral maxims such as the world has never been able to boast of before or since. This claim is totally unfounded. There is not only a serious defect in many of the moral inculcations attributed to Jesus, but, on the other hand, as fine moral sentiments as were ever uttered were taught by the old sages, reformers, and so-called redeemers who lived in the world centuries before his time.

If we closely examine the sentiments and ethical teachings attributed to Menu, Zoroaster, Christna, Buddha, Confucius, Mencius, Thales, Bias, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Epicurus, Sextus, Aristotle, Aristippus, Isocrates, Publius Syrus, Hillel, Philo, Seneca, Apollonius, Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius, and many others of the old worthies, they will be found replete with moral maxims of the highest order, and breathing forth the spirit of charity, kindness, and love, for which the utterances of Jesus have been so highly praised. Even the "Golden Rule," which has been applauded as the very best thing said by Jesus, was explicitly taught by some half a dozen of the sages and philosophers here mentioned, and in some instances hundreds of years before he taught it. It was highly commendable when uttered by him and it certainly was no less so when spoken by them.

The divinity of Christianity is strongly claimed upon the ground of its prevalence in the world and the large numbers who acknowledge it as the true faith. If this criterion is the true one, several other systems are equally divine, and some of them far more so. The believers in Brahmanism and Mohammedanism are each nearly equal to the number of Christians, while the Buddhists are nearly three to one. The believers in Jesus are estimated to be not more than one-tenth of the entire population of the globe, and from the progress made in conversion since the origin of Christianity, it must require several thousand years more to bring the whole world to the knowledge of the truth.

It is quite possible, however, that after the reader has carefully perused the following pages, he will be able to decide whether the persecution, torture, imprisonment, cruelty, bloodshed, and slaughter which the Christian Church has visited upon millions of unfortunate human beings are proofs of the truth, divinity, and superiority of the Christian religion. It cannot be denied that in those abhorrent features it has far transcended and thrown into the shade all other systems of religion in the world combined. D. M. B.

TRUTH SEEKER OFFICE, June 25, 1878.

THE CHAMPIONS OF THE CHURCH.

JESUS.

THE drama of Jesus' life is founded on a dream and completed in a vision. Joseph, his father, had the dream, and to Paul was given the vision, while the intervening period between the dream and the vision is filled up with a series of equally marvelous incidents. Of that dream we have a record, though it is impossible for us to understand how any one but Joseph could have direct knowledge of it, and yet Matthew records it as though he were present and saw what was going on in Joseph's mind, and heard the angel speak to him. He says: "Now, the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When, as his mother, Mary, was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost."

We are not told by whom this discovery was made, nor by what means the paternity was so definitely ascertained. The narrator continues: "Then Joseph, her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. i. 18–20).

This method of announcing the conception of a distinguished person was not wholly new, as an angel appeared to

Samson's mother in like manner: "And the angel of the Lord appeared unto the woman [Samson's mother] and said unto her . . . Thou shalt conceive, and bear a son; and no razor shall come on his head: for the child shall be a Nazarite unto God from the womb, and he shall begin to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Philistines" (Judges xiii, 3, 5).

Matthew seems to have this passage in his mind when he writes of the angel's announcement to Joseph, for he adds (ii, 23), "And he came and dwelt in a city of Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene." There is no other passage to which the writer can refer than that which, speaking of Samson, says, "The child shall be called a Nazarite."

The slightest acquaintance with mythology reveals to us the intercommunication between the gods and men. In all times and in all countries the gods have come down from Olympus, or up from the ocean, or out of the forests to talk and feast with their earth-born children. These associations led to more intimate relations, and hence so many heroes of antiquity were reputed to be the sons of different gods. Some traces of this are found in the Bible: "The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose" (Gen. vi, 2).

Some 330 years B. C., Alexander the Great was reputed to be the son of Jupiter Ammon. "He undertook a journey to the temple of Jupiter Ammon, which was situated in an oasis of the Libyan Desert, at a distance of two hundred miles. The oracle declared him to be a son of that god, who, under the form of a serpent, had beguiled Olympias, his mother. Immaculate conceptions and celestial descents were so currently received in those days that whoever had greatly distinguished himself in the affairs of men was thought to be of supernatural lineage. Even in Rome, centuries later, no one could with safety have denied that the city owed its founder, Romulus, to an accidental meeting of the god Mars with the virgin Rhea Sylvia, as she went with her pitcher for water to the spring. The Egyptian disciples of Plato would

have looked with anger on those who rejected the legend that Perictione, the mother of that great philosopher, a pure virgin, had suffered an immaculate conception through the influences of Apollo, and that the god had declared to Ariston, to whom she was betrothed, the parentage of the child" (Draper's Conflict, p. 8).

Plutarch says that there were prodigies attending the birth of Cicero. It is related of Juno that she conceived Hebe after eating lettuces. According to a common legend, Zeus visited Leda in the disguise of a swan; the same deity carried off Europa and transformed himself into a bull. On another occasion this deity gave birth to Athena, or Minerva, from his head. We find among the same traditions that Hephaestus had no father, and that Hera gave birth to him independent of Zeus, as she was jealous of Zeus, having given birth to Athena independent of her.

The Hindoo religion, in common with all ethnic religions, has its incarnations. The story of Christna is identical in many respects with that of Jesus. The myths relating to Buddha's conception and birth are of a like character: "During the two thousand years preceding the time of Jesus, the pagan nations had believed in demi-gods, sons of gods, and saviors, many of whom were held to have been brought into existence by the direct interposition of heaven, and without the assistance of a natural father. Among these may be named Crite of Chaldea, Mithra of Persia, Baal of Phœnicia, Thammuz of Syria, Indra of Thibet, Deva Tat of Siam, Zulis of Egypt, Xamolxis of Thrace, Zoar of the Bonzes, Adad of Assyria, Alcides of Thebes, Beddru of Japan, Esculapius of Egypt and Greece, Prometheus of Caucasus, Apollo, Adonis, and Hercules of Greece. To this list may be added Odin and Thor of Scandinavia, and Hesus of the Druids. It is not here claimed that these all had a real existence, or that even one of them had a real existence, but they were believed in from two to three thousand years ago. If God decided to reveal himself to man by a miraculous process, it would certainly seem a little singular that he should be under the necessity of

adopting the plans invented and believed in by pagans and heathens hundreds of years earlier" (Sages, pp. 247, 248).

"It is clearly established that the idea of demi-gods, and of the gods holding sexual intercourse with the daughters of men; of women becoming pregnant in a miraculous manner, without the coöperation of one of the male gender, was not new in this world at the time of Jesus. As has already been stated in this volume, Christna, Buddha, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, and others were believed to be begotten without an earthly father" (Sages, p. 247).

"This opinion of the miraculous birth of kings is well explained in a series of sculptures on the wall of the temple of Luxor" (Sharpe's Egyptian Mythology, Fig. 28, p. 19).

"First, the God Thoth, with the head of an ibis, and with ink and pen-case in his left hand, as a messenger of the gods, like the Mercury of the Greeks, tells the maiden queen, Mautmes, that she is to give birth to a son, who is to be king Amunothph III.

"Secondly, the god Kriaph, *the spirit*, with a ram's head, and the goddess Athor, with the sun and cow's horns upon her head, and so forth. In this picture we have the annunciation, the conception, the birth, and the adoration as described in the first and second chapters of Luke's gospel; and as we have assurance that the chapters in Matthew's gospel which contain the miraculous birth of Jesus are an after-addition, not in the earliest manuscripts, it seems probable that these ten poetical chapters in Luke may be unhistorical and borrowed from the Egyptian accounts of the miraculous birth of their kings."

Common sense will see no reasons for making unreasonable distinctions between these myths. If it is too ridiculous to believe, even for a moment, that Athena sprang from the brain of Zeus without a mother, it is equally preposterous to try to think of Jesus' coming into existence without a natural father. We are forced to conclude that Joseph's dream is an idle one; it is man's dream of the past. Thus, the first great mar-

vel in the life of Jesus fades away at the touch of reason and science into the limbo of mythology.

We may now turn to consider the last act in the drama, the vision of Paul, that he had seen Jesus after his resurrection. Although Biblical criticism according to the scientific method has demonstrated beyond a doubt the mythical character of the story of the resurrection of Jesus, yet it may be profitable for us to review the evidence as given by the New Testament.

(*a*) It is not an unusual thing for the writers to say, "he was seen," but no one says, "I saw him crucified, dead, and risen to life again in the flesh." And the obvious reason for the want of this statement must have been because they did not so see him.

Contemporaneous historians, and those who flourished immediately after the period of the reputed resurrection, are silent in regard to it. Philo, Josephus, Seneca, Pliny the Elder, Diogenes, Laertes, Pausanias, Pliny the Younger, Suetonius, Tacitus, Marcus Aurelius, and all others, are silent touching the resurrection.

(*b*) The doctrine of the resurrection was a common one among the Jews before the death of Jesus, therefore Jesus was not the author of it (Matt. xxii, 23; John xi, 24; Mark vi, 14; Luke xvi, 31). The writer of Acts (xxvi, 23) says, "That Christ should suffer and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead." If he raised the daughter of Jairus and the rapidly decaying body of Lazarus to life; if at the instant he died upon the cross, "the graves were opened and many that slept arose" (Matt. xxvii, 50), if it was so that when "Elisha died, and they buried him. And the bands of the Moabites invaded the land at the coming in of the year. And it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that behold, they spied a band of men: and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha; and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he [Elisha] revived and stood upon his feet" (2 Kings xiii, 20, 21). Now, if there is any truth in these passages of Holy Writ, Jesus was not the first to rise from the dead.

(*c*) The ascension of Jesus was certainly a most marvelous affair, an event that would naturally have produced a great deal of talk: and much would have been written about it. Yet Matthew and John have no knowledge of this stupendous miracle, before which even the resurrection dwindles into insignificance. If the ascension occurred, did not these apostles witness it? If they did, why have they not told us all about it? If they knew the full particulars of this great event, and do not tell us what they know, then we must decide that they are not trustworthy historians. The two writers (Mark and Luke) who speak of this wondrous scene seem to know scarcely anything about it. Mark (xvi. 19) says, "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat down on the right hand of God." And in Luke (xxiv. 50, 51) we read, "And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven." This is so nearly like what is said of Elisha (2 Kings ii. 11) that we might think that some transcriber had ascribed to Jesus what had been writen of Elisha.

(*d*) After the ascension it would have been the most natural thing in the world for these disciples to go about sad and dejected; but, if we may believe the writer, they on the contrary were filled with delight at the departure of their master. After he led them out to Bethany, and blessed them and was parted from them, "they worshiped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy." In holding the mirror up to nature, we see that this could not have occurred. Friends do not rejoice when their dear ones die; they do not rejoice when they are called upon to separate from one another even for a few months. The devout Christian does not rejoice with great joy when his child or companion is taken from him by death, even though he believes they have gone immediately to heaven.

(*e*) The ascension, as recorded by Mark and Luke, occurred on the day of the resurrection. It is incredible that Jesus

should come to earth to bring "immortality to light" through his resurrection, and should only remain one day to prove it to the whole world and for all time to come. This is the key-stone of the whole superstructure; namely, the proof that he rose from the dead. It would seem natural that he should show himself openly and everywhere, and for a long time, so that there would be no room to doubt concerning the fact, that he had brought "immortality to light." But he did not show himself openly to all the people, but only to chosen witnesses (Acts x, 40), and that, too, only for one day (Mark and Luke).

(*f*) But let us look further on this question as to the time Jesus remained on earth after his resurrection. At this point we meet with inexplicable contradictions. Luke, the author of Acts (i, 3), says: "He showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days." In the Gospel of Luke it is recorded that on the day of his resurrection, he was "carried up into heaven." In the same gospel it is stated that he went to heaven on the day of his death; "to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (xxiii, 43). As a slight variation, the Apostle's Creed affirms, "Suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried. He descended into hell." This, however, is not Scriptural, but a very early tradition of the Church.

We resume the statements of Holy Writ. John says he was seen eight days after his resurrection: "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst and said, Peace be unto you" (John xx, 26).

Matthew says, "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly: so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." This did not take place; Jesus was only one day and two nights in the grave. It is madness to attempt to reconcile these statements.

(*g*) Jesus foretells his resurrection on the third day; but when the third day comes, his disciples are not looking for

any such occurrence. It is not an adequate answer to say that his disciples had forgotten his words or misunderstood him.

"From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day" (Matt. xvi, 21). (For other passages see Matt. xvii, 23; Mark viii, 31; x, 34: Luke ix, 22: xviii, 33.) "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock and to scourge, and to crucify him, and the third day he shall rise again" (Matt. xx, 18).

"Language such as this, definite, positive, explicit, and circumstantial, if really uttered, could not have been misunderstood, but must have made a deep and ineradicable impression on all who heard it, especially when repeated, as it is stated to have been, on several distinct occasions. Yet we find ample proof that no such impression was made, that the disciples had no conception of their Lord's approaching death, still less of his resurrection; and that so far from expecting either of these events, both, when they occurred, took them entirely by surprise; they were utterly confounded by the one, and could not believe the other. . . . When Jesus was arrested in the Garden of Gethsemane, they first attempted resistance and then 'forsook him and fled:' and so completely were they scattered that it was left for one of the Sanhedrim, Joseph of Arimathea, to provide even for his decent burial" (Greg's Creed of Christendom, pp. 150, 151). As soon as the body of Jesus is taken down from the cross and is laid in the grave, the women, who watched afar off, undertake the task of embalming, a task which shows that they at least had never heard of his coming resurrection. "And there came also Nicodemus (which at the first came to Jesus by night), and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pound weight" (John xix, 39). And on the third day, when the women come to the grave, their only fears are that

their strength shall not suffice to roll away the stone from the entrance. If Mary Magdalene had ever heard of these predictions, it is very clear that when she saw the body was not where it had been laid she must have concluded that the promised resurrection had taken place, instead of which all she can think of is that the body of Jesus had been stolen. "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre and we know not where they have laid him" (John xx, 2).

After Jesus was crucified it would be the most natural thing in the world for the disciples to wait and watch expectingly for his resurrection on the third day. On the contrary, they had no such expectations, and were surprised when a report was brought to them that the tomb was empty. The women who came and told what they had seen were scoffed at as babblers of nonsense. For "their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not" (Luke xxiv, 11).

The writers who quote Jesus' predictions of his coming resurrection over and over again could not possibly have written the other passages which show that none of his disciples were expecting any such resurrection, because one or the other must be false; and possibly both may be; at any rate, the writer cannot be trusted.

Let us suppose that the book of Matthew was written by the apostle of that name, and that he was an eye-witness of the death and resurrection of Jesus, is it credible that he could write the predictions of Jesus' coming resurrection and specify the third day, and yet write concerning the third day, when the women brought the news to him and others that they believed them not, and yet remain unconscious of the antagonism of these two statements?

(*h*) We turn to Paul's vision. It must be borne in mind that Paul makes an equal claim with the other writers to seeing Jesus. In fact, no other writer claims to have seen him; and Paul himself does not pretend to have seen Jesus in the flesh. It should be remembered that Paul nowhere advocates the material resurrection: "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body" (1 Cor. xiv, 44). This

view seems to have been shared by Peter (iii, 18) when speaking of Jesus: "Being put to death in the flesh but quickened by the Spirit."

It is evident from 1 Cor. xv, 36, that the doctrine of the resurrection was not fully accepted by those to whom he wrote this labored argument in its favor. His method of illustration was disastrous: "that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." This sentence does not state a fact, for the seed in the ground does not die but unfolds in higher forms. The illustration is worthless, except that it may illustrate how little Paul knew of the resurrection. He believed in it as a doctrine, and the whole force of his argument rests upon this general belief—there must be a resurrection from the dead, because Christ is preached to have risen. "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen." It is not here urged as a fact that Jesus rose from the dead, and hence the inference of a general resurrection, but he reverses his order, and says if there be no general resurrection of the dead, then of course Christ has not risen. As a further confirmation of this as Paul's notion, we read, "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again" (1 Thess. iv, 14). This is not the language an eye-witness would be likely to use; he would boldly affirm what he saw.

In 1 Cor. xv, 5–10, Paul gives an account of those who saw Jesus after he rose from the grave. "And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve." But how could he be seen of the twelve when there were only eleven, Judas having hanged himself, and Matthias not having been elected until after the ascension? "After that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some have fallen asleep."

How could he be seen of above five hundred brethren when there were only one hundred and twenty until after the ascension? (Acts i, 15.) "After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles, and last of all he was seen of me also."

Now, where and when was it that Paul saw Jesus? In the twenty-sixth chapter of Acts, where he is represented as

speaking before Agrippa, and is giving the best reasons he can for his faith, he says, "And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" And all this he calls "a vision." He continues, "Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision" (Acts xxvi, 19).

Paul places his seeing Jesus on an equal footing with the seeing of all the others; in fact, no others claim to have seen him, yet he says they did; and as he only saw Jesus in a vision, then the evidence of a material resurrection falls to the ground.

This exhibits the second myth. We have now seen that the miraculous conception of Jesus, as well as his resurrection, his miraculous entrance upon this world's scenes, and his more than wonderful departure, *a la ascension*, are myths.

The Miracles of Jesus.

These also must be given up. The word miracle is without definition, or rather because there are so many different and ever-changing definitions, we can attach no signification to it that will be generally accepted, or one that will stand the test of science. On the other hand, notwithstanding the changes which science itself has to undergo, in consequence of the expanding power and acquisitions of the human mind, yet there are no good grounds for complaint that the terms science and nature cannot be accurately defined. In all the ordinary explanations of Jesus' miracles, there is an acknowledged want of the order of nature, yet this acknowledgement is suicidal to the definitions of miracle. If miracles can be proved, if it can be demonstrated that the order of nature can be interrupted repeatedly or constantly, as in the acts of

Providence, then we shall be forced to conclude that either there is no order of nature, or that all marvelous events are in accord with it, and that there is and can be no supernatural. But the real question to be settled once for all is not that of the supernatural, but it is one which concerns the narrative of the supernatural. It is not the miracles of Jesus which demand our first and paramount consideration, but the credibility of the writers. Do they record nothing but fact, so far as we are capable of judging? If not, then their records possess no unusual value. For it is evident that a miracle cannot be second-handed. It can be such only to him who witnesses it. When a miracle is not witnessed, but reported, it becomes only a myth.

Entire discredit is thrown upon the miracles of Jesus from the superstitious character of the times in which he lived. As illustrating the credulity of the people of that day, we have only to call attention to the importance attached to dreams and visions, not forgetting that the conception and resurrection began in the one and ended in the other. Besides these we have trances, angels coming in dreams and imparting wonderful information, such as a man would not believe if he was wide awake; we have devils holding possession of the human body; deaf and dumb spirits; and it is stupidly related of Jesus that on one occasion he spoke to a deaf and dumb spirit, and the spirit heard him (Mark ix, 25). If the writer had possessed a trifle more of common sense he would have arranged it so that Jesus should have first restored hearing to the deaf spirit before he began to talk to him, and then afterwards expelled him. Then, there are revelations from heaven. When Jesus was baptized by John, there came a voice from heaven (a long way to come) saying, "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." And as a proof of his fatherly love he had his "beloved son" killed. Save us from such love! Again, we have revelations of Paul when he didn't know whether he was in the body or out of it, and the revelation of John the Revelator—and such a revelation! Millions upon millions of our race have read it, and yet none of them

know what it means. This is more doubtful than the Greek oracle, for while that might be capable of two or more interpretations, yet the language was intelligible; but the great revelation of John the Revelator is something that nobody understands.

It is a common thing for Jesus to cast out devils, and thus work miraculous cures. "In all the synoptical gospels we find instances of the cure of demoniacs by Jesus early in his career, in which the demons promptly, spontaneously, and loudly bear testimony to his Messiahship. These statements occur once in Matthew (viii, 29), four times in Mark (i, 26, 34; iii, 11; v, 7). Now, two points are evident to common sense, and are fully admitted by honest criticism: 1. That these demoniacs were lunatic and epileptic patients; and 2. That Jesus (or the narrators who framed the language of Jesus throughout the synoptical gospels) shared the common belief that these maladies were caused by evil spirits inhabiting the bodies of the sufferers. We are then landed in this conclusion—certainly not a probable one, nor the one intended to be conveyed by the narrators—that the idea of Jesus' being the Messiah was adopted by madmen before it had found entrance into the public mind, apparently even before it was received by his immediate disciples—was, in fact, first suggested by madmen; in other words, that it was an idea which originated with insane brains—which presented itself to, and found acceptance with insane brains more readily than with sane ones" (Greg's Creed of Christendom, p. 167).

The superstition of the age is manifest in the deep ingraining of these many marvelous events. That Jesus should walk upon the water, or turn water into wine, or still the tempest with his voice, or raise the dead, are confirmations of the utter credulity of the age. There were some who rejected these great stories which were afloat. Men who were said to have seen Jesus, doubted (Matt. xxviii, 17). And in the case of those who witnessed the resurrection of Lazarus, some doubted (John xi, 46). His own brothers and sisters did not accept his teachings and follow him (Matt. xiii, 58).

It is not a little surprising that Jesus should say, "Because of your unbelief, for verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible unto you" (Matt. xvii, 20), when it is reported of him previously that "he did not [was not able to do] many mighty works there, because of their unbelief" (Matt. xiii, 58).

The Deity of Jesus.

In Christian sentiment, Jesus is a god, or the God. We shall not attempt to discuss this question, but shall give a quotation from Charles Bradlaugh. "The Jesus of the four gospels is alleged to have been God all-wise; being hungry, he went to a fig-tree, when the season of figs was not yet come. Of course there were no figs upon the tree, and Jesus then caused the tree to wither away. This is an interesting account to a true orthodox trinitarian. Such a one will believe, 1. That Jesus was God, who made the tree, and prevented it from bearing figs; 2. That God the all-wise, who is not subject to human passions, being hungry, went to the fig-tree, on which he knew there would be no figs, expecting to find some there; 3. That God, the all-just, punished the tree because it did not bear figs in opposition to God's eternal ordination." Why should Jesus curse (Mark xi, 21) at all? why curse anything? It would seem here that in his disappointment and anger he cursed the fig-tree just as a man curses the hammer with which he has struck his finger instead of the nail, as he flings it out of his hand. The world is rapidly concluding that the cursing business is not high-toned enough for either gods or men. "An honest god [and one that cannot curse] is the noblest work of man."

But whatever may have been the real character of Jesus (if ever such a man lived), he did not claim to be more than

man; if he did he was a religious fanatic. We see many traits in the legends of the four evangelists which bear evidence of his essential humanity. If Jesus had been sinless, why should he have accepted the baptism of repentance and reformation at the hands of John? or why should he have prayed for forgiveness of trespasses? Nay, why should he have prayed at all? And, if God, would he pray to himself? Indeed, it seems that he gently reproved one of his questioners for so much as even calling him "good," for we have it that he said, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one; that is God." Whatever may have been the nucleus for the gospels, it was at first of human character, rather than superhuman; it must have been woven around some man, and afterwards have been raised into the superhuman. Whether we have any historical knowledge of Jesus is another question, and will be treated under another heading.

The Moral Teachings of Jesus.

Setting aside the deity of Jesus, the question is often asked, "Were not his teachings superior to the teachings of all other men? Did he not give the Golden Rule to the world? And what is there in pagan writings which equal it?" Turning to Matthew vii, 12, we read, "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." If Jesus were the author of this ennobling precept, it would certainly distinguish him above men, but this wisdom was human, and had been uttered by many teachers long before the time of Jesus. Confucius said about 500 B. C., "Do to another what you would he should do unto you: and do not unto another what you would not should be done unto you: it is the foundation and principle of all the rest" (24th maxim, Confucius). Jesus concludes by saying, "For this is the law

and the prophets;" and Confucius closes his rule by observing, "Thou only needst this law alone; it is the foundation and principle of all the rest."

And it should not be overlooked that Jesus, in thus attributing the Golden Rule to "the law and the prophets," disclaims, as does Confucius, the authorship of it. John Stuart Mill is evidently correct when he says, "The gospel always refers to a preëxisting morality." Pittacus, a Greek philosopher, 600 years B. C., used a similar precept: "Avoid doing that to your neighbor which you would take amiss if he was to do it to you." "Avoid doing what you would blame others for doing," was spoken by Thales, another Greek philosopher, 640 years B. C.

"What you wish your neighbors to be to you, such be ye to them" (Sextus, 400 years B. C).

"We should conduct ourselves toward others as we would have them act toward us" (Aristotle, 380 years B. C).

"Act towards others as you would have them act towards you" (Isocrates 338 years B.C).

"Do not to others that which ye would not that they should do unto you," was a precept made use of habitually by Rabbi Hillel a generation before the time of Jesus; and he concludes, as Confucius had done before his time and as Jesus did after it, that this Golden Rule was the epitome of the law.

"That the system of morals propounded in the New Testament contains no maxim which had not been previously enunciated, and that some of the most beautiful passages in the apostolic writings are quotations from pagan authors, are well known to every scholar; and so far from supplying, as some suppose, an objection against Christianity, it is a strong recommendation of it, as indicating the intimate relation between the doctrines of Christ and the moral sympathies of mankind in different ages. But to assert that Christianity communicated to man moral truths previously unknown, argues, on the part of the assertor, either gross ignorance or else wilful fraud" (Buckle, Hist. Civ., vol. i, p. 129).

Jesus does not teach that he is the Savior of all men, but only of Jews. We give a few passages from his teachings: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. x, 5, 6); "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv, 24); "Verily I say unto you, that ye which here followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. xix, 28); "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill" (Matt. v, 17); "This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is the son of Abraham" (Luke xix, 9); "Salvation is of the Jews" (John iv, 22).

"It would appear, then, that neither the historical nor the epistolary Scriptures give us any reason for surmising that Jesus directed, or contemplated the spread of his gospel beyond the pale of the Jewish nation; that the apostles at least had no cognizance of any such views on his part; that when the question of the admission of the Gentiles to the knowledge of the gospel came before them in the natural progress of events, it created considerable difference of opinion among them, and at first the majority were decidedly hostile to any such liberality of view, or such extension of their missionary labors. The mode in which the controversy was conducted, and the grounds on which it was decided, are strongly characteristic of the moral and intellectual condition of the struggling Church at that period. The objectors bring no argument to show why the Gentiles should not be admitted to the gospel light, but they put Peter at once on his defense, as having, in preaching to others than to Jews, done a thing which, *prima facie*, was out of rule, and required justification. And Peter replies to them, not by appeals to the paramount authority of Christ; not by reference to the tenor of his life and teaching; not by citing the case of the centurion's servant, or the Canaanitish woman, or the parables of the vineyard and the supper; not by showing from the nature and fitness of

things that so splendid a plan of moral elevation, of instruction, such as a comprehensive scheme of redemption, according to the orthodox view, ought to be as widely preached as possible; not by arguing that Christ had come into the world to spread the healing knowledge of Jehovah, of our God and Father, to all nations, to save all sinners and all believers; but simply by relating a vision, or rather a dream, the most natural one possible to a man as hungry as Peter is represented to have been; the interpretation of which, at first a puzzle to him, is suggested by the simultaneous appearance of the messengers of Cornelius, who also pleads a heavenly vision as a reason for the summons" (Greg's Creed of Christendom, p. 204).

"Throughout his public life he spoke of himself as one who was sent by God for a certain purpose. What was that purpose? Was it, as the Gentile Christians so readily assumed, to abolish the laws and customs of the Jews, and to substitute others in their stead? Did he, for example, propose to supplant circumcision by baptism? the Sabbath by the Sunday? the synagogue by the church? the ceremonial observances of the law of Moses by observances of another kind? If so, let the evidence be produced. For unless we find among his recorded instructions some specific injunction to his disciples that they were no longer to be Jews, but Christians, we cannot assume that he intended any such revolution. Now, not only can no such injunction be produced, but the whole course of his life negatives the supposition that any was given. For, while teaching much on many subjects, he never at any time alludes to the Mosaic dispensation as a temporary arrangement, destined to yield to a higher law. Yet it surely would have been strange if he had left his disciples to guess at his intentions on this all-important subject. Moreover, it came directly in his way when he censured the Pharisees. He frequently accuses them of overlaying the law with a multitude of unnecessary and troublesome rules; but, while objecting to these, he never for a moment hints that the very law itself was now to become a thing of the past. Quite the

reverse. The Pharisees were very scrupulous about paying tithes, and disregarded weightier matters; these, he says, they ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone. If those tithes were no longer to be paid (at least not for the same objects) why does he not say so? Again, he charges them with transgressing the commandment of God by their tradition; where it is the accretions around the law, and not the law itself, which he attacks. In one case, he even directly imposes an observance of the legal requirements on a man over whom he has influence (Mark i, 44). Moreover, he himself evidently continued to perform the obligations of his Jewish religion until the very end of his life, for one of his last acts was to eat the passover with his disciples. The only institution which he apparently desires to alter at all is the Sabbath, and there it is plain that he aims at an amendment in the mode of its observance, not at its entire abolition" (Amberley's Analysis of Religious Belief, pp. 319, 320).

It was to the lost sheep of the house of Israel that he came; and even when his own received him not, he sought no converts among the Gentiles. He never intimated that he would receive such converts without their previous adoption of the Jewish faith, and after his decease his most intimate disciples disputed whether it was lawful to associate with uncircumcised people (Acts x, 28; xi, 2, 3).

Another evidence that Jesus did not come to be a Savior of all men is manifest in his doctrine of the near approach of the kingdom of heaven. A great revolution was to take place on earth; God was to come accompanied by Jesus to reward the virtuous and to punish the wicked. A totally new order of things—a new heaven and a new earth—was to be substituted in place of the present unjust and unequal order of things. And a chief purpose in the mission of Jesus was to warn the people of Israel to prepare for this kingdom of heaven. "There was but little time to lose, for even now the day of judgment was at hand. . . . Far from him was the notion of founding a new religion to be extended throughout

the world and to last for all ages. It was a work of much more immediate urgency which he came to do. 'Prepare for the kingdom of heaven, for it will come upon you in the present generation'" (Analysis of Religious Belief, p. 321).

It is clear that Jesus expected the speedy coming of the kingdom of heaven. "Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled" (Matt. xxiv, 34; Mark xiii, 30; Luke xxi, 32). "There be some standing here that shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (Matt. xvi, 28). "Verily, I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come" (Matt. x, 23). "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" (John xxi, 23.)

We must not fail to notice that, inasmuch as these prophecies were not fulfilled, and are not yet fulfilled, Jesus was a false prophet. His prediction about being "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" did not come to pass, and his promise and prediction to "them that believe," namely, if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them," has never been verified.

Strychnine is no respecter of persons. Again, he predicts and promises that "there is no man that hath left house or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake and the gospel's, but he shall receive a hundred-fold, now, in this time" (Mark x, 29). This was never fulfilled. No man — not even his immediate followers, who could say "we have left all and followed thee" — has received a hundred-fold, "now, in this time."

It is plain that Jesus did not profess to be the savior of all men, but only a shepherd seeking to gather the lost sheep of the house of Israel, in other words, a reformer of the Jewish religion. His kingdom was from above, and he had no purpose to establish a church. That was an aftergrowth from the religious agitations of his day. The Christian religion sprang, as have most others that we are able to trace, from some religious excitement, or from memories and teachings of noted men.

"At the commencement of his career as a religious reformer, Mohammed had no desire to establish a new religion, but simply to restore that pure Theism which he found underlying both Judaism and Christianity" (World's Sages, Thinkers, and Reformers, p. 321).

Luther began his public career only as a reformer, and not as the founder of a new faith. Wesley began as a reformer; he had no thought of leaving the Established Church until borne on by events; he then formed classes, which have resulted in the Methodist Church. John Fox was another reformer, consequent upon whose life the Society of Friends became a religious organization. Our forefathers sought reform in the Colonial Government in 1776, never dreaming of national independence.

These instances may serve to show how it is possible that the outcome of Jesus' agitation, the organization of the Christian Church, may never once have entered his mind, but was manifestly the work of evolution, the evolution of the religious sentiment.

It is plain that Jesus did not come as a universal savior, but only as a shepherd to gather the lost sheep of the house of Israel, a reformer of the Jewish religion.

Jesus does not Respect the Rights of Property.

With Jesus, poverty is a virtue, wealth a vice. "Blessed be ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God" (Luke vi, 20): "But woe unto you that are rich, for ye have received your consolation" (Luke vi, 24).

It is not even hinted that it is the righteous poor who are to be rewarded, or that it is the wicked rich who are to meet with woe. The naked statement was evidently designed to make poverty a virtue and wealth a crime. The same thing is taught in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. The

one goes to heaven, that is, to Abraham's bosom, because he was poor, and the other to hell, because he was rich. Say what we may, our civilization is built upon wealth. Civilization, the highest and noblest estate of man, is achieved by the utter repudiation of poverty. The legitimate love of money is the spur of all human progress. Christendom would speedily degenerate into barbarism if this respect for property was removed.

His views of poverty are in harmony with his teachings on other human interests: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth;" "Take no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself." How evident it is that one of the most essential virtues of life is here repudiated.

Thoughtfulness about the future is a distinguishing trait of a wise man. To take no thought for the morrow would be as foolish as for one to bind himself hand and foot on the approach of his enemy. Science inspires man with earnest inquiry about the morrow, and also enables him by his perception of it how better to live to-day.

"Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away" (Matt. v, 42). Society as it now exists would not last a single day if his command were obeyed. Borrowing and lending is poor business, even as it is now carried on, but what it would become under the universal practice it would be impossible to guess.

"And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? For sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again" (Luke vi, 34). So impracticable a precept is this, that no people have ever practiced it, nor could it be carried out without the demoralization and overthrow of civilization.

Another violation of the rights of property was displayed by Jesus when he went "into the temple of God and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money changers, and the seats of them that

sold doves; and said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves" (Matt. xxi, 12).

These persons engaged in changing money and selling doves were conducting a legitimate business, and were probably no worse than others of their trade. They sat outside the temple for the purpose of receiving the current Roman coinage and giving the national money, which alone the authorities of the temple received in exchange.

There were occasions in life which required an offering of doves; these, too, were sold in the precincts of the temple.

These were common and legitimate customs, and had they been unrighteous in the estimation of Jesus, he could have disapproved of the practice and tried to persuade the people to reform the abuses. In overthrowing the table of the money changers he assumed unjustifiable measures; and to stigmatize them as thieves was not wise nor discreet, as his subsequent career proves. From this time onward the Jews sought to arrest him and bring him to trial.

Jesus does not respect the rights of property in taking, without permission, two asses which do not belong to him.

"Go into the village over against you, and straightway you shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her; loose them and bring them unto me. And if any man say aught unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them, and straightway he will send them. All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy king cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt, the foal of an ass. And the disciples went and did as Jesus commanded them, and brought the ass, and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and set him thereon" (Matt. xxi, 2–7).

The writer would have us believe that Jesus rode upon two asses at once; but the prophet who could invent such a story must have been an ass himself to suppose that Jesus could ride upon two donkeys of such unequal size at one time. It was not the prophet, however, who perpetrated this outrage

upon common sense, but Matthew, whoever he was. Mark, Luke, and John mention the affair, and all agree in speaking of one ass only. Had the writer read the prophet aright, he would have quoted it differently, "Behold thy King cometh unto thee, . . lowly, and sitting upon an ass; even a colt, the foal of an ass" (Zech. ix, 9).

Matthew was intent upon making Jesus fulfill that "which was spoken by the prophet," but in this case he rather overdid the matter. It was too much fulfillment. But it matters not whether there were one or two animals: it is plain that Jesus had no legal claim in the case, and the incident shows on his part that he lacked a proper respect for the rights of property.

Something very much akin to this crops out in the parable of the laborers. A householder hires laborers to work in his vineyard. Some he hires in the morning, others at the third, sixth, ninth, and eleventh hours. At the close of the day he gives to all a penny (*denarius*). Those who had worked all day complained of this dealing as unjust, "Saying, These last have wrought but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day." His answer (Matt. xx, 13), "Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny?" does not fully cover the case.

In a legal point of view the householder had fulfilled his bargain; still, it might have been urged that the bargain itself was not of an equitable character. Plainly, a sum which is adequate pay for an hour is inadequate for ten or twelve; and that which is sufficient for a day is excessive for an hour. Manifestly there was injustice in the bargain. And the same argument applies to the future state. If, as is so often urged, it is to be a compensation for the sufferings of this state, then it ought to bear some proportion to those sufferings. But how can this be effected? Jesus saw the difficulty, and endeavored, but not successfully, to meet it by this parable.

Another instance of this disregard for the interests of others is exhibited by Jesus where he casts the devils out of two men and permits them to enter the swine, "and the swine ran violently down a steep place in the sea and perished in the waters." Mark (v, 12,) says there were about two thousand head, but there is not a word said of the equity of this proceeding. Who indemnified the owners of this stock for their loss? In this affair Jesus does not offer any compensation for the destruction of property which had been caused by him. He does not make anything like an apology, nor even an explanation. No wonder, then, that the people became alarmed at this and asked him to go on his journey with as little delay as possible. "The whole city came out to meet Jesus; and when they saw him, they besought him that he would depart out of their coasts" (Matt. viii, 34).

Jesus Was a Communist.

"And all that believed were together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need" (Acts ii, 44, 45).

"Neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common" (Acts iv, 32). But his system of communism failed, because it lacked the spur of individual possession. At the present day communism is an unsuccessful experiment. In a limited way it may work good results. It may be adapted to certain classes who seek definite ends, but in general it possesses no universal elements of civilization. Its natural tendency must be to generate and foster idleness.

Jesus Teaches the Duty of Submission to Wrong.

The general doctrines of resignation and contentment are incompatible with strength of character and progress in life. The most worthy members of society everywhere are just those people who have the least resignation and contentment. Jesus does not seem to have cherished these conditions himself. He was neither contented nor resigned to the social status about him. "The powers that be" did not seem to him to be from above, but from beneath, and he accordingly waged war upon the existing social evils. But Jesus also teaches the duty of submission to wrong: "And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek, offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloak forbid not to take thy coat also. Give to every man that asketh of thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again" (Luke vi, 29, 30). Just think of it! "And of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again." Society would be overthrown in a day if this command was carried out. We should have no commerce, no law protecting our various interests, no civilized society. Paul echoes the same notion when he says, "Now, therefore, there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?" (1 Cor, vi, 7.)

Suffer yourself to be defrauded! If human life has any virtue at all, it surely consists in some degree in doing the very opposite, that is, in not suffering ourselves to be defrauded. It is true that love seems at first sight to be an all-important virtue, and one incapable of abuse; but such love as induces us to submit to wrong is spurious. In the world as it exists about us, we are culpable when we suffer ourselves to be defrauded. The common virtues which are recognized by all men are courage and resistance to wrong. Everywhere

our eyes turn, we look to see the hero who nobly resists the wrongs and frauds which the powerful perpetrate upon the weak and helpless. "Resistance to tyrants is the will of God" is the modern conception of duty. And in accordance therewith we have laws prohibiting wrong and fraud. Besides, there is no manliness, self-reliance, or self-respect compatible with such craven submission, which is spiritless and purposeless. John Stuart Mill observes of Christianity: "Its ideal is negative rather than positive; passive rather than active; innocence rather than nobleness; abstinence from evil rather than energetic pursuit of good. In its precepts (as has been well said), 'thou shalt not' predominates over 'thou shalt.'"

Jesus Professes to Pardon Sin.

On one occasion, when Jesus sat at meat in a certain Pharisee's house, a woman came behind him and sitting down at his feet kissed them, and washed them with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head; and Jesus applauds this menial service by saying: "Therefore, her sins which are many, are forgiven." "Therefore." Are we to understand that the woman's sins were forgiven because she washed his feet? What has washing of feet to do with the pardoning of sin? We can see no connection between these two things. That there is virtue in the washing of feet, we must admit, and that in some instances it is more of a virtue than in others; but certainly in all such cases the merit consists in the actual washing being done by the proprietor of the feet.

It must not be overlooked, also, that the woman had not asked to have her sins pardoned. The most common sentiment among Christians is, that repentance goes before remission, but here there is nothing said about sin or pardon on the part of the woman. According to the method of modern revivalists, it is necessary now-a-days for the sinner "to rise,"

"to kneel," "to come forward," "to call upon God mightily," before he will speak peace. But in those days we read of, it was different; all that was then necessary was to wash the feet of Jesus, and the work was done. In some cases even this was not necessary. We read of an instance where the sinner did not even come to Jesus. His friends brought him; he was "sick of the palsy, lying on a bed; and Jesus, seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee. And behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, This man blasphemeth" (Matt. ix, 2).

There is not the least intimation of any virtue on the part of the man; he does not exhibit any compunction for sin, or any faith in Jesus; but, on the other hand, Jesus gives the credit of faith to those who brought the sick man, and seeing their faith, etc., he consented to grant pardon of sin.

Jesus Exhibits an Imperfect Sense of Justice.

In failing to recognize the rights of property; in his denunciation of the rich; in his teachings of submission to wrong; in his professing to pardon sin, even before it is asked for; Jesus errs. This moral sense is lacking in his teachings concerning God. Take this as an illustration: "Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say unto him, Friend, lend me three loaves; for a friend of mine in his journey is come to me, and I have nothing to set before him. And he from within shall answer and say, Trouble me not; the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee. I say unto you, Though he will not rise and give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will rise and give him as many as he needeth" (Luke xi, 15).

And so it is with God, he leads us to believe, for though he is our friend he will not grant our requests; but if we annoy

and tease him, at last, worn out, he will answer our prayers to get rid of us. Therefore, "Ask and it shall be given you; for every one that asketh receiveth."

The parable of the unfortunate widow is another instance in point: "There was in a city a judge who feared not God, neither regarded man [same kind of judges in our cities now]. And there was a widow in that city, and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. And he would not for a while; but afterwards he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man, yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me" (Luke xviii, 2–6). It is just so in praying to God. He may not hear you or heed you at first, yet by a "continual coming and troubling him," he must of necessity at last become weary and grant you the desires of your heart, in order to escape trouble and weariness.

At one time the scribes and Pharisees brought a woman to Jesus who had been taken in the act of adultery, and asked him for his judgment. He said: "He that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone at her." This was a well-directed rebuke, and they felt it, and they "went out one by one, beginning at the eldest even unto the last." Then Jesus, standing alone with the woman, asks, "Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee; go and sin no more" (John viii, 7–11).

In all parts of the Bible adultery is condemned, and by all civil laws it is now prohibited, and all religious teaching forbids it, and there is no reason in this case why Jesus should not have condemned the act, even while he showed mercy towards the actor. Here as elsewhere Jesus shows mercy at the expense of justice. Were this principle carried out in life, the criminal would go untried and unpunished.

The following saying of Jesus exhibits the lack of the high moral sense of justice, and also the fact that he does not pretend to be the savior of the whole human race. He said to his own countrymen: "Unto you it is given to know the mys-

tery of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables; that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them" (Mark iv, 11). From this we learn that Jesus did not desire to save the Gentiles; the parabolical style was used in order to prevent them from becoming converted and having their sins pardoned.

In addition to this imperfection of the moral sense, Jesus was also sometimes unforgiving in his spirit and practice. He says on one occasion, "Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. x, 33). Again he is reported to have said, "But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me" (Luke xix, 27).

It is true that he taught his disciples to love their enemies, but it is a precept he did not observe himself; he allowed himself to speak of those who did not accept his teachings as "fools," "hypocrites," "thieves," "serpents," "vipers," and many other abusive epithets, which clearly exhibit on his part anger and hatred. In that little myth about the dying thief on the cross, we have another instance of his spirit of unforgiveness. It is there recorded that Jesus prayed for the forgiveness of his enemies, but had he been consistent with that prayer he would not have pardoned one thief without also having pardoned the other. When he could ask God to forgive his enemies, it would have been demanded by his own rule that he also forgive them; but, on the contrary, he only forgives the malefactor who spoke words in his praise. This spirit is carried out in the doctrine of future rewards and punishments.

It is plain that he taught the doctrine of future punishment, if not endless punishment. It was an endless punishment to those who committed the unpardonable sin: "And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy

Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come" (Matt. xii, 32).

In other places, too, the horrible doctrine of endless torment is asserted by Jesus, and all the efforts of his modern disciples to explain it away are in vain. The tares are to be bound up in bundles and burned. The wicked are to be cast into a furnace of fire, where there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth (Matt. xiii, 30, 42, 50). It is better to enter into life mutilated than to be thrown unmutilated into the fire of hell (Matt. xviii, 8, 9); of hell which is never quenched (Mark ix, 43). The servant who had no money was cast into outer darkness (Matt. xxv, 30). The righteous go into eternal life; the wicked to eternal punishment (Matt. xxv, 46).

This threatened vengeance once terrified poor mortals into all sorts of slavish services. Sacrifices were offered of all sorts of precious things, not excepting human life. But the dawning light of the new era of science has dispelled the old slavish fear of the angry gods. Experience has taught mankind that they must work out the problem of life, not with fear and trembling, but with courage, intelligence, activity, and hope.

Jesus' teachings tend to destroy the natural affections: "For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law" (Matt. x, 35). "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke xiv, 26).

Of course, we have explanations upon explanations of the meaning of these words, but as they are the plain words of revelation, and not oracles, hidden mysteries, or enigmas, we need no explanations. They explain themselves; and while they do so, they show that Jesus' teachings were eminently fitted to destroy human affections and derange the domestic relations.

Jesus' teachings about divorce are unjust: "And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry

another, committeth adultery against her" (Mark x, 11). There is no modification or qualification on his behalf, even though he be innocent and she guilty. And the same injustice is found in language concerning the wife: "And if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery" (Mark x, 12). She may be pure, while her husband was incontinent, yet if she marries again she commits adultery. Again, Jesus says, "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery" (Luke xvi, 18).

In this case there is some lack of qualification as to whether the man be innocent or not; and there is no allowance made in case the man who married her who was put away should be ignorant of her being a divorced woman.

Once more: "But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery, and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery" (Matt. v, 32).

Here we find not a word said about the fornication of the husband. In short, there is no equality of rights and duties taught in these passages. Jesus, in the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, teaches that it is adultery to marry a divorced woman. No matter what the crime of the husband has been, a wife is not allowed to put him away and marry another. If he is a fornicator, and his wife is divorced from him and re-marries, she commits adultery. This is only a slight modification of the divorce law—that old law according to which the husband had only to write his wife a bill of divorcement and send her off; but it was not lawful for the wife to write a bill and send the husband away. All Christian nations have repudiated the teachings of both the Old Testament and the New on the question of divorce.

Marriage is now rapidly losing its sacramental character. If matches are made in heaven, it is evident that the work is poorly done, and for all practical purposes they might as well be made on earth; and the general opinion is inclining so

strongly in that direction that greater attention is now given to the laws of life, which instruct us how to make happy earthly matches, leaving the matches of heaven to be formed when we get there.

The more liberal and humanitarian views of the present set aside the Christian doctrine of a sacramental marriage, an indissoluble bond, and it is regarded as a contract, which should be dissoluble when it becomes injurious to the contracting parties. This view seems to be slowly but surely eradicating the cast-iron bands of the matches made in heaven which render countless thousands miserable on earth, and which cause them to transmit their unhappy conditions to the children they beget.

Jesus teaches that it is a virtue for men to mutilate themselves "for the kingdom of heaven's sake." He says: "For there are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb; and there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men; and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it" (Matt. xix, 12).

This is plain enough: "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

The language of Jesus wears the appearance of fanaticism: "Come unto me," "Take my yoke," "And learn of me," "Whosoever will confess me," "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me," "For my sake"—all these are not only exhibitions of a sublime egotism, but they betray fanaticism. Why should the "me" be substituted for truth and duty? We always find "me and mine" to be the expression of selfishness, the very opposite of philanthropy. There is no humanitizing power in the "me" spirit, whether found in Jesus or in Judas. "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs." Which of God's children are dogs? "Neither cast your pearls before swine." What part of the human race could the Son of God call swine? "Ye are from beneath; I am from above." "All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers." "Behold,

I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers; how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" One who could use such language as this was certainly moved by an intense fanaticism.

"All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matt. xi, 27).

Addressing his heavenly father, Jesus exclaims, "All mine are thine, and thine are mine" (John xvii, 10); and again: "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father" (John x, 15).

"A Jesus," observes Strauss, "who can say such things of himself has no existence for historical consideration."

What else but fanaticism could have led Jesus to tell his friends that they might drink poison and suffer no harm? "And these signs shall follow them, that believe; . . if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them" (Mark xvi, 17, 18). We read almost every day of "believers" being poisoned to death. Strychnine, arsenic, or paris green, will poison a Christian as quickly as a Freethinker. Even beverages which are not considered "deadly things" sometimes hurt the "believer," as, for instance, cider, grape-juice, coffee, and tea. No intelligent Christian living would risk his life upon the truth of this text by drinking a full dose of a "deadly thing" to prove to the world that there is a God in Israel. And so far they are wise; but they are not "believers;" they do not believe in this passage; they are Infidels.

If Jesus had been a perfect being, and had assumed the office of teacher, he would have condemned human slavery and tyrannical government; he would have explicitly enunciated the principles of human rights. Among the many needed reforms, he would have urged the rights of woman. But the abolition of slavery and the elevation of woman were causes he did not advocate. And in respect to marriage he had no well-defined views. The evidence of this is seen in

the fact that he himself did not marry, and that he advised others to mutilate themselves—that is, make eunuchs of themselves "for the kingdom of heaven's sake"—and that his teachings concerning divorce are not founded upon justice and equity.

We have examined the evidence of Jesus' supernatural character, let us now turn to the historical evidence of his existence. Contemporaneous history is silent as to the existence of Jesus.

The following very pertinent argument is made use of by the Rev. S. Baring Gould in his "Lost and Hostile Gospels:"

"It is somewhat remarkable that no contemporary, or even early, account of the life of our Lord exists, except from the pen of Christian writers. That we have none by Greek or Roman writers is not, perhaps, to be wondered at; but it is singular that neither Philo, Josephus, nor Justus of Tiberias should have ever alluded to Christ or to primitive Christianity. Philo was born at Alexandria about twenty years before Christ. In the year A. D. 40, he was sent by the Alexandrian Jews on a mission to Caligula, to entreat the emperor not to put in force his order that his statue should be erected in the temple of Jerusalem and in all the synagogues of the Jews. Philo was a Pharisee. He traveled in Palestine, and speaks of the Essenes he saw there; but he says not a word about Jesus Christ or his followers. It is possible that he may have heard of the new sect, but he probably concluded it was but insignificant, and consisted merely of the disciples, poor and ignorant, of a Galilean rabbi, whose doctrines he, perhaps, did not stay to inquire into, and supposed they did not differ fundamentally from the traditional teaching of the rabbis of his day."

The interpolations of Josephus and Tacitus have been refuted too often to need mention here. We have now reached the conclusion that there is no historical evidence of the existence of Jesus excepting such as we find in the Gospels.

Concerning the place of his nativity, we have no information, for two equally credible or incredible biographers contra-

dict each other. Matthew (ii, 1) says he was "born in Bethlehem of Judea." But there are other passages which suggest serious doubts as to whether Jesus were really born in Bethlehem. "In the first place, the Jews are frequently represented as urging that Jesus could not be the Messiah, because he was not born at Bethlehem, and neither Jesus nor his followers ever set them right upon this point. If he were really born at Bethlehem, the circumstance was not generally known; and though its being unknown presented an obvious and valid objection to the admission of his claim to the Messianic character, no effort was made, either by Christ or his disciples, to remove this objection, which might have been done by a single word. (John vii, 41–43, 52.) 'Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was? So there was a division among the people because of him. Again, the Pharisees object to Nicodemus when arguing on Jesus' behalf: 'Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet'" (Greg's Creed of Christendom, pp. 130, 131). Jesus never speaks of the place of his nativity. Luke speaks of him as "Jesus of Nazareth;" and Jesus, in his discussions with the Pharisees, wished it to be thought that he was the Messiah; he wished it to be thought that the Messiah was not the son of David. He himself, therefore, was certainly not the son of David. All this discussion between him and the Pharisees was a denial that he was the son of David, or that he had been born in Bethlehem.

As to the time when Jesus was born, we have no positive information. Matthew says he was born in Herod's time, and that Herod caused all the little children to be killed on account of him. Luke says Jesus was born in the time of Cyrenius, when Augustus Cæsar gave orders that all the people should be taxed. Now, Cyrenius succeeded Archelaus, who reigned ten years after the death of Herod. Here is a contradiction that cannot be explained away. The exact day of Herod's death can be almost arrived at, as shown by

Josephus, who says that on the night preceding the death of Herod there was an eclipse of the moon. In calculating back to the time of this eclipse, it is found to have occurred on the fourth of March, four years before Christ; another perplexing discrepancy. Matthew says he was born in the days of Herod, and John says it was in the days of Cyrenius, fourteen years afterwards. Again, Mark and Luke say Jesus began to be thirty years of age in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, the very day of whose accession is known; and by counting back, we find Jesus must have been born four years before the Christian era, which disagrees entirely with the statement of Matthew.

Professor John Fiske remarks that while the Jesus of the dogma is the best known, the Jesus of history is the least known of all the eminent names in history. "Persons who had given much attention to the subject affirmed that there were not less than one hundred and thirty-two different opinions as to the year in which the Messiah appeared" (Conflict Between Religion and Science, p. 184).

Dr. Adam Clarke, on observations of Luke ii, 8, in his Commentary, says: "The nativity of Jesus in December should be given up. The Egyptians placed it in January: Wagenseil in February; Bochart in March. Some mentioned by Clemens Alexandrine in April; others in May. Epiphanius speaks of some who placed it in June, and others supposed it to have been in July. Wagenseil, who was not sure of February, fixed it as probably in August; Lightfoot on September 15th. But the Latin Church [Catholic], supreme in power and infallible in judgment, placed it on the 25th of December, the very day on which the ancient Romans celebrated the feast of their goddess, Bruma. Pope Julius I. (in the fourth century) made the first alteration, and it appears to have been done for this reason." The Christians often aim to make an argument that the chronology of the Christian era is established by the confirmation that is given by the years being numbered from the supposed birth of Jesus, but it is no proof at all. The idea of counting the years from

the advent of Jesus was not thought of for several centuries after the time when the vague legends said he was supposed to have lived. The plan of numbering the years from that apocryphal event was first invented by a monk, Dionysius Exiguus, about 530 after Christ. It was introduced into Italy not long after, and was propagated by Bede, who died in 735. It was ordered to be used by the bishops in the Council of Chalcedon in 816, but was not generally employed for several centuries afterwards. It was not legalized before 1,000. Charles III. of Germany was the first sovereign who added "In the year of our Lord" to his reign, in 879. (See Haydn's Dictionary of Dates, and Encyclopædia of Chronology.)

Now, in recapitulation, let us see how much, by the common sense method of the interpretation of the gospels, we have been forced to reject as incredible.

First, we saw that Joseph's dream about the immaculate conception was, after all, only a dream, and that such dreams were not uncommon; Samson's mother having had one which is so identical with Joseph's that we are persuaded that the latter was in some way a myth outgrown from the former; that almost all ancient men of distinction were reported to have had wonderful prodigies attending their conception and birth, and that there is no evidence in the gospels of the resurrection of Jesus. Paul saw him in a vision, but does not claim to have seen him in the flesh. And of the ascension, it is self-evident fiction.

The miracles are not only incredible from being incompatible with and contrary to human experience, but the manner in which they are related proves that they never were performed. And concerning the moral teachings of Jesus, we found great imperfection. He did not come to save all men, but only the lost sheep of the house of Israel; he taught that the end was nigh at hand, when a great revolution should usher in the kingdom of heaven, but it did not come. We found, also, that Jesus did not respect the rights of property: he despised the world; condemned the rich because they were rich, and made great promises to the poor because they were

poor; that he formed his little company on the communistic plan, but it soon failed; that he taught the duty of submission to wrong; that he professed to pardon sin, and on one occasion pardoned a person's sins for washing his feet; that he exhibited an imperfect sense of justice in a great many instances; and, lastly, we find that there is no history of him excepting the gospels, and in these there is no unquestionable record of the time when or the place where Jesus was born. We are forced to conclude that if ever there was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth, we have no trustworthy sources of positive knowledge concerning him.

JESUS AND JESUISM.[1]

Was there a Jesus, or Joshua (or by whatever other name, Hebrew, Syriac, or Greco-Syriac, he might have been called), who afforded at least a nucleus for the profuse but conflicting Gospel biographies and New Testament Christology in general? If there was—and we are inclined so to believe—then how much do we know of his life? Very little; surprisingly little, indeed; much less than many of even the most skeptical writers of his life are willing to admit.

Let us try and sift and winnow this matter thoroughly. Whew! How the chaff and dust and smut of the Pauline and Gnostic and later Greek and Oriental heap are scattering to the winds! What have we remaining as solid grain?

About eighteen hundred and forty years ago, Galilee, the northern province of Palestine, in common, indeed, with the rest of that country, was sorely tried and highly agitated over the attempt of the all-powerful Romans to subvert the whole commonwealth of Israel by at least swamping, if not indeed by stamping out, its political and religious institutions. Weaker and weaker grew the hope of successfully resisting this dreaded enemy; but, on that very account, stronger and stronger grew the longing for a deliverer—a messiah that should at least arrest if not entirely wipe out the abominable Gentile incursion and tyranny. This deliverer, it was generally believed, would soon appear if the people were worthy of him; and that he might so appear, the people were earnestly exhorted to greater piety and purity by several messiah-prophets.

John the Baptist was evidently one of these prophets. He preached repentance and a better life. Living by the side of

[1] This article and the following ones on "Peter and the Compromise," and "Paul and Paulism," were written for this work by our learned friend, T. Carn Edwards.

the Jordan, he used immersion in its waters as a symbol of purification. But this symbol was nothing new; indeed, it was quite usual among the Jews. The ignorant and excitable people flocked to this John and his baptism. It was the new sensation. Josephus tells us that they "were greatly moved by hearing his words."

Let us see, more at length, what kind of folks these Galileans were. Galilee was, at that time, from all accounts, a fruitful, pleasant, but somewhat over-populated province, mostly inhabited by Jews, but containing, nevertheless, a large admixture of foreign blood. And, moreover, its natural boundaries being not so exclusive as those of Judea, the customs and opinions of its people were modified by surrounding heathendom to a far greater extent than were those of the inhabitants of Judea. Of course, every one of them had some knowledge of the law; as this was forced upon them by the prevailing system of public and synagogue education, just as the rudiments of an English education are forced upon American youth through the agency of our public schools. But Jerusalem was the only place where the higher education could be acquired. Galilee, however, was separated from the metropolis by the intervening and heretical Samaria. No wonder, then, that the Galileans (like the Bœotians by the Grecks, and the Cornish by the English) were generally considered ignorant, especially by the Judeans. In fact, their language was so mixed with foreign phrases, and their pronunciation so corrupt and strongly marked, that they were at once recognized whithersoever they might go. Bigotry, of course, was the natural result of their ignorance. They were great religious conformists, even to the minutest details. And we all know that rank superstition also is very apt to thrive in the natural habitat of bigotry. The belief in obsession by evil spirits was a common superstition of those days. And nowhere did this belief flourish more extravagantly than in Galilee. In fine, the Galileans were, for all their native good nature, a very ignorant, excitable, and superstitious people, and easily turned into religious fanatics. This made

their unfortunate province at times a very pandemonium of insurrections, political and religious. It was poor Galilee that furnished most of the agitators and demagogues, among whom we have heard of Ezekias, Judas, his son, and Tendas. And it was there that the terrible zealots originated and mostly swelled their murderous sect.

It was to these easily excited people that John preached repentance and reformation as absolutely necessary preparations for the coming of their great deliverer. There can scarcely be a doubt that his baptism tended to promote personal cleanliness, and that his sermons had a cleansing moral effect upon large audiences, whatever we may think of all this as preparing the way for the Lord. Like the old prophets, John was evidently no respecter of persons, as his affair with Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of the province, abundantly proves. Herod had flagrantly violated the Jewish law in marrying Herodias. For this, John openly rebuked him. The tyrant, dreading what might come of John's great influence with the people, threw him into prison, where, upon the savage instigation of Herodias, he was soon beheaded.

The extinguishment of John was the signal for somebody to take up his work. We are not without examples in these days and in this country of the eagerness with which would-be reformers, especially of the social stripe, step at once into the place of their dying, or at least supposed-to-be dying, predecessors. In one or two noted instances this highly egotistic and sensational eagerness ludicrously failed of its mark, as said predecessors, for all the tragic account of their dying symptoms, would not die after all. And we all know what ridiculous figures their precocious would-be successors then made of themselves. But John was really beheaded, and consequently, without a doubt, died. So there was a fine opening for any competent man to ventilate himself as his prophet-successor. Jesus, an obscure young rustic of Nazareth (not of Bethlehem), about whose lineage we really know nothing, immediately commenced that business in his own little native city. There, however, his friends and acquaintances did not

take very kindly to him in his new role. He consequently turned his attention to Capernaum, a small town on the northwestern shore of the lake of Tiberias. The simple fishermen and lower classes generally of that place followed him in flocks and clung to him and his words. One Peter opened to him his house, which became his home, and the center of a large circle of his admirers. He was the new prophet of the time; and being such, he, of course, had to cure the sick and the obsessed, and perform other wonders and miracles. All this was simply demanded of him. Miracles were intensely believed in through all that region of country, and the new prophet had to step into line. Of course, those who easily believed were easily cured. And of course, also, all the afflicted who were operated upon and not cured on the instant, professed to have their diseases either alleviated or cured, as well out of courteous sympathy with the miracle-worker as from the consideration that otherwise they might be deemed hopeless reprobates. Most probably the vast majority of those who came to him for miraculous succor felt like crying out, "I believe; O Lord! help thou my unbelief!" On the whole, Jesus was a great success in the eyes of the poor and superstitious populace of Capernaum. And this success must have indelibly impressed itself on his consciousness, and naturally elicited the extravagant and zealous praise of his disciples and followers. In the face of all this, how could he help regarding himself as the long-promised Messiah? He dared not at first give utterance to this magnificent thought, but he sweetly gave himself up to the power of its entrancing fascination. And, as is the case with most of us to-day, "to hear from others what in our inmost heart we wish to hear, but dare not express with our lips, gives us more assurance: and thus Jesus continually solicits others to tell him what—as the most secret but also the most cherished thought—is buried in his own bosom; yet, as soon as it is uttered, his soul is startled, he shrinks back, and requests its concealment from all other men." So at last he unhesitatingly undertook the

arduous mission of a messiah; and his followers constantly increased in Galilee.

But yet, rustic Galilee was of comparatively little importance so long as Judea, and particularly Jerusalem, would ignore his pretensions. The better educated classes of the metropolis naturally held an ignorant Galilean in deserving contempt, especially when he undertook to teach them and to play the prophet over them. The Pharisees thought they had the Messianic key safely hanging from their girdles, which was, mainly, the advocacy of the equality and priestly sanctity of the whole people, and this was to be brought about, if not now, at least at the time of the coming of the great deliverer. The high-toned and learned Sadducees, satisfied with their elevated position, were not at all anxious about the new order of the Messianic times, and therefore smiled, often cynically, but mostly good naturedly, upon the Messianic hopes of the populace. Good-naturedly, did we say? Yes, verily, except in days of public commotion, when the Messiah stock usually ran very high and became quite dangerous to the common weal. Then, as law-abiding citizens, and for some time after, indeed, until the new excitement would have utterly died away, they frowned it down and helped quell the commotion by every means in their power.

Perhaps Jesus was so ignorant and unsophisticated as never to have found out all this. Perhaps not. Whatever might have been the case, if his growing fame was not soon to become eclipsed it seemed absolutely necessary to establish it in Jerusalem, the capital and the heart of the nation. After much hesitation he resolved to appear there during the great festival of the Passover. This was, undoubtedly, the fittest season for the agitation of his pretensions. The city would be full of unsophisticated, credulous, superstitious, and expectant country people from all quarters, including, of course, a host of Galileans, among whom would be his friends and adherents. These were just the right kind of folks to work upon—so much more easily moved and convinced than the more intellectual and reflecting citizens. Surrounded by his

followers, he entered the city, and going up to Mount Moriah, he commenced the practical work of his city mission by overthrowing the tables of the money changers, and the seats of them that sold doves in the templar courts. This, to us at this day, may appear quite presumptuous. But we must remember that he passed as a prophet, and that such an act was not deemed presumptuous, or at least, not an unusual piece of insolence for a prophet.

But here were the Romans. Every sensation created by prophet or agitator in those days had become somewhat dangerous to the commonwealth, as it always gave the masters of Judea a pretext for interference, an interference often culminating in slaughter and cruelty. On this festival of the Passover special precautions were usually taken. The Roman governor of the province, who had his official residence in Cæsarea, came to Jerusalem. The garrison was strengthened and kept ready for service at all hours, so that at the slightest notice, if any riot should happen, the soldiers could rush upon the people. No wonder, therefore, that the Passover festival was uniformly dreaded by the Jewish authorities of those times, as during it there had already happened frequent conflicts between the Jewish pilgrims and devotees and the Roman soldiery.

It did not help matters to declare that a new dispensation was forthcoming which was not of this world. Whether this was stated in perfect good faith, or a mere worldly-wise endeavor to avoid the political matter, is not the question. If this world was to come to an end, the temporal authorities of Palestine were likewise to perish. So the Sadducees, who were the ruling party, naturally arrayed themselves against all religio-political innovations, and especially against the belief in a future world, particularly when this was made an engine of political aspiration and struggle. And in these times the high priest being a Sadducee, this party was the more eager to suppress this new movement, as he, their acknowledged head, was generally held responsible for every public disturbance. No wonder, then, that they nipped the Jesus sensation

in the bud by imprisoning this young prophet even before the commencement of the festival proper. The gospel account of this imprisonment having taken place on Passover-eve is evidently incorrect, as this was directly contrary to the Jewish law regulating festivals, courts, and trials. There can scarcely be a doubt that before the beginning of this festival the young aspirant after Messianic power and fame was brought before the tribunal of the high priest, who with all due haste convoked an informal court, which pronounced Jesus a blasphemer and worthy of death. The supreme penalty of the law, however, could only be inflicted by the governor of the province, who at that time is generally supposed to have been Pontius Pilate. He, as a Roman officer—let alone what we know of his previous record—could not hesitate to execute the death sentence upon a man who openly declared himself, by virtue of his pretended Messiahship, to be the God-appointed king of the Jews. The mode of execution, also, was to be Roman, the horrible and ignominious death of the cross. And thus, like thousands upon thousands of human beings before and after him, Jesus heroically died the death of an enthusiast or politico-religious schemer, or both. He had one grand leading idea, the Messianic; and whether this idea was pure and simple in his mind and heart, or complicated with personal ambition and love of fame, matters not; he died for it, foolishly, as we think, but heroically as we have every reason to believe.

Did Jesus declare himself infallible—a God, or equal to God? Not by any means. This was entirely an afterthought of the Alexandrian school of Christian Gnostics.

Did he claim sinlessness? Decidedly no. The Messiah was to be only a man, especially chosen by God for a high purpose; and it was not necessary, in order to play his role well, to claim exception from the inevitable accompaniments of human nature. If Christ was sinless, what need to have accepted the baptism of repentance and reformation at the hands of John, or to have prayed for forgivness of trespasses.

Nay; why should he have prayed at all, if sinless? And if God, or equal to God, would he pray to himself? Indeed it seems that he gently reproved one of his questioners for so much as even calling him good; for we have it that he said, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God." The sinlessness as well as the divinity of this young prophet is also to be attributed to the Gnostic school.

The stories of the miraculous incarnation and resurrection are not worth a moment's notice, except as the after-croppings of this same mystic school, which in time almost completely Orientalized the primitive Jesuism.

The impossible miracles that are attributed to Jesus, and the impossible prophecies twisted out of all semblance of true historic adaptation in order to force them to refer to him, were the natural concomitants of his mission, as well as that of every other religious pretender of those times, when credulity was so outrageously rampant that, in the belief of the simple populace, miracles and fulfilled prophecies, divine and satanic, were matters of every-day occurrence, and

> "Thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks
> In Vallombrosa."

To the modern mind they all are beneath contempt, except as indices to the woeful ignorance and stupidity and eager gullibility of those benighted days.

Jesus was a Jew, a Jew in every respect, and nothing but a Jew. He never dreamed of instituting a new religion. "If anybody had foretold Jesus that his exertions would lead to a new religion, by which his own Judaism would in time be persecuted with the most bitter hatred, he would have denounced such a man as a false prophet and a malignant slanderer. He who most positively declared, 'Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom,' could not think of establishing a new religion for the short time this world was yet to last. On the contrary, he was so strongly imbued with the Judaism which

then prevailed among the lower and more ignorant classes that his whole being was taken up with it and his course of life ordained by it; he was so much a child of his own time, a son of his own people, that he indeed might serve as their strongest representative. It was a time in which the national and religious feelings of the Jews in Palestine were goaded to the verge of despair. The conviction was held by many that this world was too corrupt to last any longer; this world deserves to perish, and therefore must shortly perish. The time is fulfilled; the kingdom of God is at hand; all that is left is to repent and prepare for the world which is soon to come. The genius of the people, eminently a religious one, was sick and sore at heart and soul, and a sickly religious exuberance was the natural result."

John the Baptist was the forerunner of Jesus. Jesus only completed the work of John. All his ethics, proverbs, and even his methods of teaching were eminently Judaistic. So were all his general doctrines, with the exception, perhaps, of three; namely, those of voluntary improvidence, non-resistance, and the ignoring and sundering of the ties of the family, of society, and of the commonwealth (in view of his theory of the world being soon to perish); though indeed there had previously been strong indications of the growth of the first of the above doctrines among rich Jews and rabbis.

Jesus taught Hillel's golden rule of reciprocity, and made it the key-stone of all morality; "while, inconsistently enough, he commands in another place what is impossible—to love our enemies, with which is coupled the erroneous statement that of old it was commanded to hate our enemies, which commandment is nowhere to be found. Indeed, being so wrapped up as he was in the contemplation of the immediately forthcoming end of this world, and his life and thought and desire constantly dwelling, as it were, in the life to come, as the only object worth living for, what wonder is it that we find such a confusion of ideas whenever he undertakes to give directions as to the affairs of this poor, sinning, and vulgarly real world? He was, like hosts of other enthusiasts and dreamers before

and after his time, a very unpractical man, set free from the sober industries of life, despising every employment but his self-appointed mission, a great friend of women, children, and easily-impressed men, with whom he delighted to roam over the valleys of Galilee and sail on the lake of Gennesareth, and from whom he naturally expected, and not in vain, to find his simple living. In fact, he "Galileeized" generally, preaching his gospel of the coming of the ideal life. He was a natural poet; but, like most primitive poets, was too much inclined to take poetry for sober reality, and to act thereon. Jesus undoubtedly was a religious genius; his whole being was drawing away from the real to the ideal; and thus the childlike confidence in the goodness and mercy of God, as taught by Judaism, could easily be turned in his mind into the childish idea that whatever man may pray for from his heavenly Father, if he does it with true faith and implicit trust, and does it persistently, it will be granted, just as an indulgent father will grant everything to his beloved crying child, though it be irrational: 'And Jesus, answering, saith unto them, Have faith in God. For verily I say unto you, That whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe, that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith.' Such a faith naturally stimulated him to persevere in his adopted role to the bitter end. With God everything is possible; his kingdom may come any time, and then the Messiah will be revealed to all mankind. It was the staff and support on which he leaned securely, while he had to suffer for his idea, which he never gave up until, perhaps, in the last moment, in the agony of death, when he exclaimed in the psalmist's words, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'"

His frightened disciples and followers, after this tragic death of their leader, scattered like doves, and made straight home for Galilee. Jesus was dead, that was certain. But, in their excited imaginations, he must soon rise from the dead, and

appear to them and to all as the glorified Messiah. Of this wonderful feat of resurrection, setting aside the many contradictions in the three relations of the synoptic gospels, we have remaining only the testimony of Mary Magdalene, "a nervous, amorous, and excitable woman, out of whom Jesus had driven several devils; that is to say, a woman afflicted with periods of insanity."

"It is scarcely necessary to say that this resurrection took place only in the imagination of Jesus' followers, and the process by which this was accomplished was a very natural one. We all know our state of mind when one who is near and dear to us has departed. . . . . Even if we ourselves have closed his eyes, have brought the dear relics to their last resting-place, it seems that we must meet the dear departed one whenever we enter the house; we hear his voice, the fall of his footsteps in the hall, on the stairs; we cannot believe separation forever to be possible. Thus it is in every common case; but here were men and women excited by unusual hopes and fears, who had left everything else in this world, and followed their dear master, in whom they had the never-flinching faith that he would introduce the new world, and reign over it in glory, in which they all would participate. This beloved friend and teacher had gone they knew not whither. Was he dead? . . . He will rise; perhaps he is risen already. The thought was scarcely conceived, when the excited imagination saw the resurrected Christ. Such an excitable spirit as that of Mary Magdalene had to see him first. 'She saw him,' was spread abroad among the disciples, who had now recovered from their first fright and flight, of which they felt somewhat ashamed. With their returning confidence and trust, especially as they had to redeem their reputation, what was more natural than that Jesus should soon appear to some or all of the apostles, and, at last, to a multitude of people? Jesus was no longer a false prophet; he was the Messiah, who would soon come again with the new world, 'when the last will be first, and the first last.' Why should such a comforting thought be given up? To remain

faithful to the beloved teacher was very pleasing to their expectations.

"They soon returned to Jerusalem, formed a congregation of the saints, who differed from the other Jews in nothing except the belief that Jesus was the Messiah, and as such would soon return, when the new earth and the new heaven would be founded. Of his [few specific] doctrines, [not more specific and peculiar than those of several other Jewish prophets,] they carried out as much as was possible to be carried out in this miserable world; but the distinguishing points were too insignificant to make them appear as a special sect of the Jews. They would undoubtedly soon have relapsed into the ranks of the other Jews, had not another master-mind taken hold of this new idea of the resurrected Messiah, to lead it victoriously to the conquest of the world. It was Paul who founded Christianity, and . . . his spirit entirely overshadows that of Jesus in the system of Christianity."

Now, if this be so, and we firmly believe it is, what did Jesus himself distinctively do? We shall here treat of this question at some length.

Jesus introduced into later Judaism what may be distinctively and correctly called Jesuism; to wit, the ultimate assumption by a Messianic prophet of the Messiahship itself. As we have before intimated, and as one of the most famous of all Christian preachers in all ages and lands has declared in his fractional "Life of Jesus," "they only misconceive of Christ's genius who believe he intended to establish a religion." He neither intended nor attempted to do anything of the sort. Before his coming, there had appeared in Jewry many Messianic prophets and preachers of distinctive Messianic ideas; but not one of them, as far as we can gather, proclaimed himself or allowed himself to be proclaimed as the very Messiah already arrived in person, and shown to appear in all his Messianic glory. He did this cautiously and hesitatingly at first, but afterwards more directly and openly, and never gave up the fond belief and assumption until the very last moment, if indeed he did so then.

Let us take a cursory view of some of the most prominent Messianic ideas and messiahs that had appeared and been preached in Israel previous to the time of the Nazarene.

The very first Messianic idea that we have any inkling of from the "sacred books" of the Jews amounted to this: "that the people of Israel, by propagating their laws and institutions among the nations, would become the savior of the world." This primitive idea, as particularly preached by the prophet Joel, was grandly impersonal and cosmopolitan.

But alas! the cruel course of events stood fatefully in the path of this idea, and soon turned it out of its original direction. During the subsequent incoming of heathenishness, the Messianic idea underwent its first great and important modification. According to this, the Lord was to be forever sole sovereign of his people, but his ruling of the world would be transferred to his anointed king, *i. e.*, the Messiah. This made the idea purely personal. It was mostly preached by the northern prophets, Amos, Hosea, etc., but was ultimately accepted by the southern, Isaiah II., Micah, and Zechariah I., without damaging their cosmopolitan conception of the Messianic blessing.

Not long afterwards the idea assumed a distinct personality. Isaiah the First prophetically proclaims King Hezekiah as the very Messiah. The weak Ahaz was in despair, owing to the conspiracies and threats of the kings of Syria and Israel. The people were in great trepidation. But Isaiah, almost alone, was confident of divine help. In his address to the skeptical and wavering king, he gives him a sign: "Behold, this young woman [pointing to a young woman in the crowd, the erroneous translation of the Hebrew *almah* into *virgin* is too well known as such to need correction] shall conceive and bear a son, whose name she shall call Emmanuel" (God with us), "'for he shall witness the misery breaking upon the people, and also the salvation of the Lord.' The salvation came; Ahaz was delivered from his enemies, but instead of strengthening himself by the national faith, he thought it more politic to introduce the Assyrian idolatry.

. . . The faithful would have been driven to despondency if it had not been for the hopes they placed in the coming king, the young, hopeful, and promising prince Hezekiah, who probably was under Isaiah's tuition. He was to be the Messiah, and of him Isaiah says: 'The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. 'For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.' . . . . . But alas! it was not even the shadow of all those bright hopes entertained by the people and their prophets. Hezekiah was a good, pious, and virtuous king, but not equal to the many adverse circumstances that surrounded him; he was not what Isaiah had hoped and expected."

After this sore disappointment, however, the hopes of the prophet and people still remained unshaken; they were only pushed forward to a more distant future, when "there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots. . . . The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Thus figuratively sang Isaiah I, and the same hopes inspired his young pupil Micah, who exclaims, "And thou, Bethlehem Ephratah [Bethlehem in Ephraim, not near Jerusalem] . . out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel." "It became part and parcel of the Messianic belief that the Messiah was not only to be a branch out of the root

of Jesse, but was also to be born in Bethlehem; hence the legends in the New Testament of the descent and birth of Jesus."

Throughout Israel's greatest calamity, throughout the woe and misery of the (hypothetical) Captivity, the Messianic idea of a great deliverer was still kept alive. Even Jeremiah, the gloomiest of prophets, had confidence in a glorious restoration. "The more thoughtful became convinced that the Messianic time could only be brought about by a moral elevation of the whole nation; that purity of heart and soul, of intention and action, must be the root out of which the Messianic time would spontaneously grow and blossom, and bring the noble fruits promised by former prophets." This noble sentiment we first find expressed by Jeremiah; and Ezekiel, the prophet proper of the so-called Captivity, and probably the pupil of Jeremiah, follows closely in the great Lamentator's track.

But "Ezekiel does not speak of a messiah-king. David is prince, the first among equals in the kingdom of the Lord. With the destruction of the commonwealth of Judah (586 B. C.) and the Babylonian exile, the royalistic tendency of the Messianic hopes loses ground, and the idea again widens to its original, universal, and cosmopolitan meaning. . . . But yet another thing is here to be observed. With Ezekiel it is no longer a branch that is to rise out of the house of David; it is David himself who is to be raised up (from the dead). The Messianic idea has again to adopt itself to a new conception." Whether there ever was such a person as this David or not, is here out of the question. We know that in the times of Ezekiel, as well as long before, the Davidic tradition, to say the least, was firmly imbedded in the heart of Jewry, as, for example, the later Arthurian tradition in the heart of Cambria. And as King Arthur—whether he ever did exist or not—was for long, long centuries eagerly expected by his people to return from the fairy spirit-land of Avalon, avenge his countrymen, and reinstate them in the sovereignty of Britain, so Ezekiel, discarding the branch that was to rise out

of the house of David, speaks of David himself as the one who is to rise from the dead with all the rest of the righteous of the nation—he being their one shepherd, and they led and fed as his flock. This new idea of the resurrection of the dead—closely allied to their older belief in the immortality of the soul—the Jews found among the Parsees of Babylonia: and they seized it eagerly, and at once married it to their great Messianic hope.

Isaiah II., the great agitator of the Captivity, still "assumes a far loftier position. Neither the house of David nor David himself is mentioned any longer; he sees the Messiah in Cyrus, the victorious king of Persia, who will break down Babylonia, Israel's house of bondage, loosen the chains of the captives, set them free, and restore the old glory of Zion." (See Isa. xxxii, xlv, lii, lvi.)

But alas! for all the great deliverance that Cyrus really brought, or is believed to have brought to Israel, the second Isaiah's disappointment in him as the Messiah was as great as that of the first Isaiah's in Hezekiah. Still, hope deferred did not by any means blast his or the people's undying confidence in a still forthcoming greater deliverance and deliverer. In the distant future they yet see accomplished what Hezekiah and Cyrus—though they did well—utterly failed to bring about.

Henceforth David's house, formerly such a prominent element of the Messianic idea, loses more and more of its importance. Only Haggai and Zechariah III. faintly refer to it in the person of Zerubbabel, one of the two leaders of the returned exiles, he being of David's house. He is called a seal and the chosen of the Lord, and "The Branch" *par excellence.*

But as it was the restoration of their temple and cultus that was most at the heart of the new generation, Zerubbabel was soon overshadowed by Joshua, the son of Yotzadak. The priestly family supersedes the royal. What is emphasized now is not the temporal but the spiritual influence which Israel will exercise over the nations, "when the law shall go

forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Malachi, the last of the prophets, very significantly voices these changed hopes. "He does not expect a Messiah-king, but a messenger, a forerunner, who is to prepare Israel, or the world, for the great day of the Lord, when he will come and judge and then rule alone. This messenger is no longer the anointed king, the Messiah, but Elijah the prophet. (See Mal., iv. 5.)

Henceforth, during the three centuries from the supposed restoration of the second temple to the Maccabean era (500–175 B.C.), the history of Israel shows almost a blank. Rest and relaxation were sorely needed; and when they came, they were well employed. During this period the Jewish colonies in Palestine willingly resigned themselves to the great surrounding world-powers that superseded each other. And during this season of comparative internal peace, brought on by irresistible external pressure, the Mosaic laws and institutions were developed and became so rooted in the minds and hearts of the people that they soon became proof forever afterwards against this great besetting sin—idolatry. They became the most faithful preservers of the law, and the belief in one God; this faith and this law becoming actually dearer to them than country and nationality. "Therefore, when Antiochus Epiphanes (176–164 B. C.) threatened to deprive the Jewish colonies in Palestine of this inheritance, the old heroism was reawakened. Such a time of cruel oppression and persecution, followed by glorious victories of the few undisciplined patriots over the magnificent and dreaded armies of the Syrians, naturally recalled the old Messianic hopes of the people. The book of Daniel, written at that time, interprets the national feeling of those days. To enlist at once the interests of his contemporaries, the author ascribes his book to a certain supposed Daniel who lived during the so-called Babylonian captivity. . . . To give a *demonstratio ad hominem*, he represents the past as well as the future history of Israel in prophetic visions ascribed to Daniel in Babylonia. Now, since the past has been fulfilled according to these visions,

the predictions of the future will undoubtedly likewise be true (Dan. vii, 7). The four beasts are the four kingdoms of Babylonia, Media, Persia, and Macedonia. They destroy each other and vanish, until, on the day of judgment, they are all punished; but then (Dan. vii, 13, 14), 'with the clouds of heaven there came one like the Son of man to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him; and there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.' The 'Son of man,' who is to come with the clouds of heaven, is only a poetic expression for 'the people of Israel,' as the explanation given to Daniel explicitly states (vii, 27), 'and the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High.'"

This was another change in the Messianic idea, a return to the original conception that the people of Israel were to become the savior of the nations. And henceforth there is no more mention made of a personal Messiah at all. There is no reference to him in the book of Daniel, the Apocrypha, or the Sybilline leaves. The writer of the book of Daniel, indeed, authoritatively announces the doctrine that all the good, pious, and virtuous, who were helping to prepare this heavenly kingdom would surely rise from the dead and participate in it (Dan. xii, 1, 2).

But the Maccabean era dawned, and the people commenced to enjoy an unwonted prosperity and independence. Consequently the fervent desire for the heavenly kingdom cooled off considerably. National prosperity has always and everywhere created a present contentment that effectually did away with the need of Messianic and millenarian propheeies and assumptions, "good times coming," and all such kindred hopes, not to mention the prevalence of weird and pensive chants and airs; while national adversity has always and everywhere produced the contrary result. We see this cool-

ing-off process best from two striking incidents related in 1 Maccabees iv, 46: "And laid up the stones [of the altar which the heathen had defiled] in the mountain of the temple, in a convenient place, until there should come a prophet to show what should be done with them." And furthermore, at the election of Simon as high priest and ruler (xiv, 41) we read: "Also that the Jews and priests were well pleased that Simon should be their governor and high priest forever, until there should arise a faithful prophet."

"Henceforth the formula of the Messianic belief was: 'The prophet Elijah will come to spread light and truth, restore everything to its true and proper position, right all those who were wronged, bring near all those that were removed.' (See Babylonian Talmud.) The state of affairs under the Maccabees was considered temporary; but as it proved quite satisfactory, the hopes for a different future became more and more theoretical only.

"This, however, changed entirely when Herod seized upon the government (37–4 B. C). He was of foreign (Idumean) descent; instead of the lion of Judah, the jackal of Idumea had assumed the power, and, with his craftiness and cunning, was undermining the mountain of the Lord. With the same cruelty and unscrupulousness with which he had extirpated the ruling high-priest family of the Maccabees, he now oppressed the people. To do this securely, he was compelled to lean on the all-powerful Romans, and acknowledge them his and his country's lords and masters. Under his successors, who inherited all his vices, but none of his virtues, Palestine was made a Roman province, where Roman oppression and greediness vied with that of the Herodians to drive the people to despair. At the time of Jesus, days again came when the Jews of Palestine could think of the future only with trembling and despondency. The iron heel of the Romans was upon their neck: they were prostrated, and had not the power to rise; their foremost men, the aristocracy and priestly families, fawned for the oppressor's smiles; the different parties were in continual controversy and enmity;

what was yet to be hoped for? This world was ripe to perish, and the new world, of which the prophets had spoken so enthusiastically, if it ever was to come, must now surely come. But it could be brought about only by a strict observance of the Mosaic law, and by conscientiously living up to it; therefore repentance and greater piety of the whole people were necessary. Prophets like John the Baptist arose, who exhorted the people to repent and return to the Lord, for the kingdom of the Lord was near at hand; enthusiastic fanatics, like Judah of Galilee, the founder of the Zealots party, repudiated the rulers of this world, and declared it sinful to pay tribute to the Romans. Such agitators, with their religious enthusiasm, the burning patriotism, and intense hatred of both native and foreign oppressors, stirred up the common people to a feverish restlessness, and the old hopes for the coming of a Messiah and deliverer were revived. Even of those who led a more quiet and retired life, many were nourishing the fond hope in their bosom that things could not continue this way much longer (Luke ii, 34). This corrupt world must soon perish and the heavenly kingdom commence. The leaders and agitators were confident in their expectation, but none of them aspired to more than prepare the people for the coming of the heavenly kingdom; the title and office of the Messiah remained vacant, without finding one so bold as to claim it for himself. The first who, after long hesitation and wavering, did claim it was Jesus," whose fragmentary biography we have already presented to the reader.

Assuming that Jesus really existed, we admit him to have been, on the whole, an amiable young man, very fond of women and children, a whole-souled if ignorant man, and honestly wrapt up in his missions as prophet and Messiah, and that we entirely disbelieve the bad reports of him given in the gospels, such as cursing the fig-tree, the scribes, and the Pharisees, his threats of eternal torments, his assumption to be God, or equal to God, and so forth. These are evidently after thoughts of his dogmatic biographers; and we shall not here condescend to recite them to his disadvantage.

The Progress of Jesuism.

Very insignificant, indeed, were the immediate results of Jesus' life and mission. The writer of the Acts of the Apostles tells us that the followers of Jesus were only about one hundred and twenty; while we learn from Josephus that other prophets who appeared soon after Jesus, and agitated the people by similar promises, had thousands of enthusiastic followers.

But under the leadership of the more prominent disciples of Jesus this little band of his faithful adherents formed a small congregation, or rather community, which led a quiet, unostentatious, communistic life, but did not deviate in the least from the laws of Moses and the doctrines of Judaism, as then taught. In process of time this little band grew to be numerous and strong, until it had become quite formidable by the time that Paul was in the heyday of his assumed apostleship.

We learn from a careful perusal of the four unquestionably authentic epistles of Paul—the one to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, and the one to the Galatians, which were written about twenty years after the crucifixion (that is, about A. D. 50)—that there were fierce and animated struggles between the Jesuism of Peter and John and James (the brother of Jesus), and Paulism. Paul, in all his epistles, contended against another gospel and another doctrine, which differed decidedly from what he was teaching his converts. And what was this different gospel? It was not Christianity at all. It was the gospel as preached prior to the concoction of this very name even, because prior to Paul's assuming the office and title of apostle; it was the gospel as taught to the Jesuistic congregation in Jerusalem by Peter and John and James; it was the gospel which the disciples who personally

attended Jesus declared to be that of Jesus; in fact, it was pure Jesuism, the specific Messianic doctrine of a new Judaistic sect, nothing less and nothing more.

But, on the contrary, "Paul's gospel is entirely his own, as he himself declares that he never condescended to learn from man (Gal. i. 12, 16, 17); that is to say, from those disciples who personally attended Jesus. Not until the third year of his [self-appointed] apostleship was he moved to go from Damascus to Jerusalem. He found the atmosphere of the original" congregation of Jesuists there "so uncongenial that he kept aloof from it, and only conversed with Peter and James; and after remaining but two weeks, he departed, somewhat disgusted, to resume his own gospel with renewed vigor in Antioch. His is the gospel to the heathen world which declares 'the law' abolished, and in the epistles to the Galatians even as a hindrance to the true belief in Christ. This doctrine amazed the Jew-Christians [Jesuists] in Jerusalem. Many of these frequently came to Antioch, others were purposely sent, and there arose endless quarrels. Paul's new converts were estranged from him; and he was represented, by those who ought to know best, as a heretic, whose doctrine was entirely and fundamentally opposed to that of Jesus, his true disciples and followers. Paul, therefore, to make an end of these vexations, felt constrained to go to Jerusalem and lay his doctrine and plan of converting the heathen world before Peter, James, and John—before 'those who seemed to be pillars of the church,' or 'the very chiefest of the apostles,' as he sometimes ironically calls them. After very stormy debates, a compromise was agreed upon, and they gave him the right hand of fellowship. Paul was to be acknowledged as the apostle of the heathen, while Peter was to remain the apostle of the Jews. How weak this compromise was in establishing peace between the two opposing parties is to be seen from the fact that very soon after this Paul was again involved in ugly quarrels, and this time with Peter himself, whom he charges with hypocrisy (Gal. ii, 11–13). 'But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the

very face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas [his faithful companion] also was carried away with their dissimulation.'

"How strong and powerful this [Jesuistic] anti-Pauline party must have been, we may conclude from the influence they exerted even in the churches founded by Paul. Not only in Antioch, which could easily be reached from Jerusalem, but also in Corinth, he had the same adversaries and the same struggles. In Corinth was the church which he loved most, loved with a passion and jealousy that could not be surpassed by the most enamored youth. How often he prays in his epistles, 'Wherefore, I beseech you, be ye followers of me;' how often he assures them, 'Ye are in our hearts to die and to live with you;' how he glories in them: 'Are not ye my work in the Lord?' 'For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be grieved, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you.' Nothing pains him more than that they also should desert him and his gospel: 'If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you.' 'I am become a fool in glorying; yet ye have compelled me; for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest of the apostles, though I be nothing.' Yet he has scarcely departed and gone to Ephesus when he again learns how his opponents, even in this, his pet church, are becoming stronger and stronger; there are already many who say 'I am of Cephas,' *i. e.*, Peter. These opponents decry him in every way; they deny him the title of apostle, and speak of him slightingly as of one who has no authority (2 Cor. xi, 4, 12, 18; xii, 11), 'while they come well recommended from the very pupils of Jesus in Jerusalem' (2 Cor. x, 12); they call him the corrupter of the gospel (2 Cor. x, 2, 7): 'But I beseech you that I may not be bold, when I am present, with that

confidence wherewith I think to be bold against some who think of us as if we walked according to the flesh.' 'If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's.' They mock the bombastic style of his epistles, contrasting it with his personal appearance and heavy speech (2 Cor. x, 10): 'For his letters, they say, are weighty and powerful; but his bodily presence is weak and his speech contemptible.' The bitterness wherewith he defends himself, and entreats his Corinthians to remain faithful to him, shows how influential his opponents must have been: 'For I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy' (2 Cor. xi, 4): 'For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit which ye have not received, or another gospel which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him. For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest of the apostles. But though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge; but we have been made thoroughly manifest among you in all things,' and so on through the whole chapter.

"The whole burden of his epistle to the Romans"—a congregation "risen from among the many Jews in Rome, without the effort of any of the apostles—is nothing but the defense of his doctrine, which declares that the gospel was sent to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, and therefore 'the law' must be superseded by faith. There were undoubtedly evil reports of him spread among them (Rom. iii, 8), which he wished to dispel before coming to them, as he intended to do after his journey to Jerusalem. He thought he could conciliate his opponents in Jerusalem by bringing them the rich contributions he had gathered from among his heathen converts for the 'poor saints' in Jerusalem, as he had promised to do when the compromise (Gal. ii, 10) between him and the original apostles was accomplished, and which, indeed, he very zealously did. He came triumphantly to Jerusalem, but his reception was far from what he expected. The money he brought was called a bait held out by him to the true apos-

tles [the Jesuists], that they might acknowledge his title of apostle and admit him to their ranks. Thus, hated by the Jews as an apostate, and by his own church as a heretic, he fell into the hands of the Romans, who brought him first to Cæsarea, and then to prison in Rome, from which he was never released. This is the plain and simple story of the first generations after Jesus." See how these Jesuists and Christians loved one another!

PETER,

AND THE GREAT COMPROMISE.

In our treatise on the progress of Jesuism we have seen how, after the crucifixion, Peter, as well as John, and James (the brother of Jesus) adhered to the gospel of Jesus simply; and in our chapter on Jesus and Jesuism, we have shown at some length what that gospel was. It was (to recapitulate) simply the belief that Jesus was the Messiah, and that as such he would soon return, when the new earth and the new heaven would be founded. All this was within the pale of Judaism, Jesuism being only one of the various schisms or sects into which Judaism had latterly split.

We shall not here repeat what we have already said about Peter, in our juxtaposition of his gospel with that of Paul; nor shall we attempt any labored biography of him who was, centuries after his death, forced by Romanism into the position of primate of the Church. The truth is, there are no materials extant for the construction of such a biography. Suffice it here and now to state, that most of what we read about Peter in the New Testament is entirely unreliable. However, we shall here present the outlines of his "unhistorical biography"—as there presented—as a mere matter of curiosity, before entering on the subject of the great compromise between Petrinism and Paulinism:

We read that Peter, the chief of the twelve apostles, was born at Bethsaida, on the sea of Galilee, and was a brother of Andrew. It appears his original name was Simon; but when he became a disciple of Jesus, he received the name of Peter, which in Greek signifies "rock"—the rock on

which his master was fabled to build his Church, and which elevated him in the Catholic Church to the "Apostolic primacy of the Church of God." He was also sometimes called Cephas. His occupation was that of a fisherman. He was a man of ardent temperament, affectionate and generous, or hateful and bigoted, as the case might be. It seems he was favored with special manifestations of his Master's confidence, and performed a more prominent part in his work than any other of the twelve disciples. Peter and Andrew were the first of the apostles in the order of time. On several occasions Peter acted as spokesman for his fellow-apostles; and it is supposed by many that he possessed some preëminent authority. When Jesus was arrested, it seems Peter drew a sword and cut off the ear of the high-priest's servant. This, even if brave, did not betoken a very mild character, though it was a fair prototype of the lamb-like meekness and mildness of the coming Christianity. In the severe crisis that followed the arrest, however, his faith and courage failed, so that he denied his Master. But having recovered from this lapse, through hearty repentance at the crowing of the cock, he became a zealous and powerful minister, and spoke with great effect at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. He is then made to raise Tabitha, or Dorcas, from the dead, and perform other miracles. After the very human compromise with Paul and Paulinism, he is fabled to have led a divine mission to preach the gospel to Cornelius, a Gentile. About A. D. 44 he was cast into prison by Herod, the king, but, lo and behold! he was delivered by an angel! The last we read of him in the New Testament is in the account of the Council of Jerusalem about A. D. 50. (See Acts xv.) Tradition adds that he preached in Galatia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Pontus, and that he suffered martyrdom in Rome about A. D. 65.

And now to the great compromise. After Jesus' permanent disappearance, to remain faithful to the beloved teacher was very pleasing to the expectations of his disciples. "They soon returned to Jerusalem, formed a congregation of saints, who differed from the other Jews in nothing except the belief that

Jesus was the Messiah, and as such would soon return, when the new earth and the new heaven would be founded. Of his doctrines they carried out as much as was possible to be carried out in this miserable world; but the distinguishing points were too insignificant to make them appear as a special sect of the Jews. They would undoubtedly soon have relapsed into the ranks of the other Jews, had not another master-mind taken hold of the new idea of the resurrected Messiah, to lead it victoriously to the conquest of the world. It was Paul who founded Christianity; and . . . his spirit entirely overshadows that of Jesus in the system of Christianity."

As we shall see in our article on Paul, a compromise, after long disputes, was agreed upon between him and Peter and the other original apostles. It was to this effect: Paul should be acknowledged as the apostle of the heathen, who might remain free from the law, and be considered "proselytes of the gate;" the Jesuists, however, would continue to labor as apostles of the Jews, for whom the law remained valid and binding.

But alas! this miserable expedient would not, could not work. This was soon to be seen, when, shortly afterward, Peter came to Antioch, and, at first, lived and ate with the Gentiles, but withdrew as soon as some of James' church came from Jerusalem and remonstrated with him. "This example of Peter, one of the chiefest of the apostles, naturally influenced many of Paul's converts, as even Barnabas had followed Peter. The inconsistency of allowing to the heathen Christians what was prohibited to the Jew-Christians, and the disadvantage under which the newly-founded religion would have to labor by maintaining two separate camps within her pale, were plainly to be seen. It was impossible to gather all the heathen into her folds, as long as the Jew-Christians, with the observance of the law, remained a kind of aristocracy, who tolerated the large class of Gentiles only as those who lagged behind." Paul now took a very decisive step by boldly cutting loose the new religion from its parent trunk,

Judaism. He declared the Jewish law to be not only superfluous and obsolete, but a hindrance and a curse; the observance of the law to be not only immaterial and unmeritorious, but a sin against the Holy Spirit and the true belief in Christ. But of this more anon.

THE FOUR EVANGELISTS.

MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE, AND JOHN.

WHO these persons were we know not. We have no record of them; for it is certain that the Matthew and John who were apostles of Jesus were not the writers of the gospels which bear their names; and of Mark and Luke we have no knowledge. It is generally conceded that it is not known when, where, or by whom the gospels were written, hence it is absolutely impossible to give a biography of their authors. Yet, as so much importance is attached to these writings on the ground of their supposed apostolic and inspired origin, it is fitting that a few pages should be devoted to them. We have just affirmed that it is not known when, where, or by whom the gospels were written. "It is certainly remarkable," says Canon Westcott, "that in the controversies of the second century, which often turned upon disputed readings of the Scripture, no appeal was made to the apostolic writings. It does not appear that any special care was taken in the first age to preserve the books of the New Testament from the various injuries of time or to insure perfect accuracy of transcription." He might with equal propriety have said, It does not appear that in the first age there were any books to preserve. He continues: "They were given as a heritage to man, and it was some time before men felt the full value of the gift. The original copies seem to have soon perished." This is an admission that we know nothing of the original copies.

"It is remarkable that Celsus, living in the middle of the second century, and able to make inquiries of aged Jews

whose lives extended from the first century, should have been able to find out next to nothing about Jesus and his disciples, except what he read in the gospels. This is proof that no traditions concerning Jesus had been preserved by the Jews, apart from those contained in gospels, canonical and apocryphal" (S. Baring Gould's Lost and Hostile Gospels, p. 45).

Milman speaks of the early history of the Church as the "age of total obscurity" (vol. i, p. 42). "The papacy grew up in silence and obscurity" (p. 47). The names of the earlier bishops of Rome are known only by barren lists, by spurious decrees and epistles.

Origen confesses that there are no sources of information concerning Jesus save what is found in the gospels; for in reply to one of Celsus' claims of having still additional evidence besides what he has given, he says, "He [Celsus] pretends that he has in store abundance of munitions of war to discharge against Jesus and his doctrine, but in fact he knows nothing with the appearance of truth except those particulars which he has culled from the gospels themselves."

This is a plain admission that there were no other records at that time (about A. D. 150) which contained anything of Jesus or his doctrine.

To attempt to get original copies out of the floating mythology of the first age of the Church is a hopeless endeavor. So thoroughly overrun with myths is the story about Jesus of Nazareth that it is impossible to say anything positive of his life and character. And the myths which grew up in Judea relative to him must, from their very character as myths, have undergone many changes before there was any gospel of Christ. "I hear that there be divisions among you, and I partly believe it; for there must be also heresies among you" (1 Cor. xi, 18, 19). And even the first records, or the original copies, must have been brief and fragmentary. The growth of the myth was continued after the present gospels were written, as we have many interpolations and many so-called apocryphal gospels.

As no one person was the author of Grecian mythology, so, too, the mythology of Judea is not the product of one original writer, whom others copied, but it was the outcome of many minds, through many ages.

"As a proof of the puerility of the Jews in their notions of literary criticism, it is only necessary to recollect that the book of Enoch—an evident imitation of Daniel—written under Herod the Great, is seriously quoted by the apostle Jude (verse 14) as composed by the 'seventh from Adam'" (Mackay).

"It is remarkable that they [synoptics] should each relate very nearly the same events, when the events which attended the life of Jesus were so numerous that if they were all written the whole world would not contain the books; that the materials were abundant we have only to turn to the fourth gospel. It is at least strange that three writers should have so nearly made the same choice. But this is not all. Not only are the things related the same, but the language in which they are expressed is the same. Sometimes the resemblance is such as would have arisen had the evangelists been translating from a common document in another language. Sometimes, and most frequently, there is an absolute verbal identity—sentences, paragraphs, long passages, are read word for word the very same.

"This implies an original and central narrative from which all the different accounts are copied or transcribed" (Froude's Short Studies).

These writers make no claims to supernatural inspiration. "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed" (Luke i, 1–4).

This writer makes no claim to inspiration, but declares that he is moved to write because "it seemed good" to him to give his version of the tradition. It seemed good to him to write "forasmuch as many" others had written. The gospels were not confined to Matthew and Mark, but there were many gospels. Some writers assert that there were more than a hundred gospels. These writings did not claim to be written under inspiration, nor does Luke so regard them, for if he wrote after Matthew or Mark, he does not hesitate to change their language and meaning; and if either of these wrote after him, they also do not regard his writings as inspired. He does not write even for general edification, but only for the personal instruction and confirmation of Theophilus: "That thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed."

As the Church increased in numbers and power, the sacred books acquired authority, and the conflicting character of the gospels demanded that there should be some decision as to which of them were the word of God and which were not.

Papias, the Christian Father, informs us as to the manner in which this selection was made at the Council of Nice, in 325, in these words: "This was done by placing all the books under a communion-table, and upon the prayers of the council the inspired books jumped upon the table, while the false ones remained under."

"About the year 363 another council was called at Laodicea to make a more perfect selection of the holy books. This time the plan adopted was by vote; when the books now accepted as canonical—with the exception of the books of Hebrews and Revelations—were adopted. Luke's gospel was admitted by the majority of a single vote, so nearly did it meet rejection. After this, other councils for again settling the credibility of the gospels and epistles were held. One occurred in 406, and another in 680. The first rejected some of the books which had been accepted in 363, which afterward the council of 680 again restored. In these councils, in the language of a writer upon the subject 'the sacred

writings—the word of God—was tossed like a battledore from sect to sect, and altered as the spirit of faction dictated.' The utmost turbulence and disorder often marked the action of these councils, and the bitterest quarrels between bishops and priests raged when the truth or falsehood of the several books was under discussion. The well-known Christian writer Tindal thus describes one of these scenes: 'Indeed, the confusion and disorder was so great amongst them, especially in their synods, that it sometimes came to blows; as, for instance, Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, cuffed and kicked Flavianus, patriarch of Constantinople, with that fury that within three days after he died.' This was the class of men who decided which writings were to be accepted as the word of God and which not" (Sages, etc., pp. 250, 251).

Jesus, it seems, did not deem it best to give the world a written revelation, and there is no evidence that he authorized his disciples to write one, or that they claim to have done so.

"It is somewhat remarkable that no contemporary, or even early, account of the life our Lord exists except from the pens of Christian writers. That we have none by Greek or Roman writers is not, perhaps, to be wondered at; but it is singular that Philo, Josephus, nor Justus of Tiberias should have ever alluded to Christ or to primitive Christianity" (S. Baring Gould's Lost and Hostile Gospels).

How did the early Christians know the genuine from the apocryphal gospels?

How did they know that one class of writings was plenarily inspired, and that all others were not thus inspired?

By what means were they enabled to select the inspired from the profane and vulgar writings? Church history informs us that all the sacred books were placed under a table at the Council of Nice, and the genuine books jumped upon the table and left the others lying on the floor.

"The gospels nowhere affirm, or even intimate, their own inspiration—a claim to credence, which, had they possessed it, they assuredly would not have failed to put forth" (Greg's Creed of Christendom).

"I must acknowledge that the Scriptural narratives do not claim this inspiration for themselves" (Dr. Arnold's Christian Life).

"I cannot find any such claim made by these writers, either explicitly or by implication" (Coleridge's Confessions).

Evidence that all Gospels had only One Source.

Suppose we should find in a newpaper three letters from three different correspondents in London, and each of them attempts to describe the aspect of politics there, and that they should each describe from memory speeches they heard there. Suppose that they each describe in a large degree the same events, in precisely the same language. We are not in such a case to say that they each had taken their statements from some original writing? If in addition to this we found them describing the same events in the same order and connection, question after question discussed in precisely the same language, we should be forced to conclude that these writings were not originals, but copies (Scott, p. 14).

The Writers do not Claim to be Eye-witnesses.

There are many things recorded by them which they could not possibly have witnessed; such as Joseph's dream, the story of the Magi, the temptation of Jesus, his transfiguration, his agony and prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, the denial of Peter, the dream of Pilate's wife, the conversation between Judas and the priests, and that between Pilate and the priests, and that between the priests and the soldiers about the missing body of Jesus. If the biographers of Jesus did

not witness these events, then all they knew about them was derived from the current stories of the day. The written accounts were no more trustworthy than the floating myths. "For not long after Christ's ascension into heaven, several histories of his life and doctrines, full of pious frauds and fabulous wonders, were composed by persons whose intentions, perhaps, were not bad, but whose writings discovered the greatest superstition and ignorance. Nor was this all; productions appeared which were imposed upon the world by fraudulent men as the writings of the holy apostles" (Mosheim, vol, i, p. 40).

The writers of the gospels do not give their own names. This is highly significant. The names affixed to these gospels were appended to them long after the time of Jesus. Bishop Faustus (Faust. Lib. 2), in speaking of these early writers says: "It is an undisputed fact that the New Testament was not written by Christ himself, nor by his apostles, but a long time after their time by some unknown persons, who, lest they should not be credited when they wrote of the affairs they were little acquainted with, affixed to their works the names of apostles or of such as were supposed to have been their companions, and said they were written according to them."

By most scholars, Matthew's has been regarded as the oldest of the gospels, and yet the text of Matthew points to a period long after the death of Jesus. We may cite a few proofs.

"In [Matthew] xxiii, 35 we have the following passage, purporting to be uttered by Jesus in the course of his denunciations against the scribes and Pharisees. 'That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.' Now, two Zachariases are recorded in history as having been thus slain, Zacharias son of Jehoiada, 850 years B.C. (2 Chron. xxiv, 20), and Zacharias, son of Baruch, 35 years after Christ (Joseph., Bell. Jud. iv, 4). But when we reflect that Jesus could scarcely have intended to refer to a murder committed

850 years before his time, as terminating the long series of Jewish crimes, and moreover, that at the period the evangelist wrote, the assassination of the son of Baruch was a recent event, and one likely to have made a deep impression, and that the circumstances of the murder (between the temple and the altar) apply much more closely to the second than to the first Zacharias, we can not hesitate to admit the conclusion of Hug, Eichhorn, and other critics, that the Zacharias mentioned by Josephus was the one intended by Matthew" (Greg's Creed of Christendom).

Zacharias being slain thirty-five years after Christ, it places the composition or compilation of Matthew's myths some time after that event, and the writing of the other gospels at a still later date. "And from the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force" (xi, 12). Whatever the meaning of this obscure passage may be, it is evident that the phrase "from the days of John the Baptist until now," clearly implies that the writer lived at a time long after the days of John the Baptist. The passage is, therefore, from the writer of Matthew's gospel, and not from Jesus.

"He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi, 15, 18).

The word "church" indicates a later date than the time of Jesus. Another passage of similar import may be found in Matthew (xxviii, 15). "This saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day."

We find passages in John which imply a late date. "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our witness" (John iii, 11). Such an expression is wholly out of character as coming from

Jesus, who was not testifying to anything at all, but merely propounding a mysterious dogma to a dull scholar. And this language about the "church," and "testifying that which we have seen," and "This saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day," all shows that the writers of the gospels wrote at a period long after the alleged life and death of Jesus.

After a very critical survey of the earliest writings of the Christian fathers, namely, the Clementines, the Epistle to Diogenetus, the writings of Basilides, who published a gospel, the writings of Valentinus, of Marcion, of Tatian, of Dionysius of Corinth, of Melito of Sardis, of Claudius Apollinaris, of Athenagoras, of the Epistle of Vienne and Lyons, of Ptolemæus and Heracleon, of Celsus, the Canon of Muratori—after a clear and full criticism of these writings, the author of "Supernatural Religion" concludes: "We may now briefly sum up the results of our examination of the evidence for the synoptic gospels. After having exhausted the literature and the testimony bearing on the point, we have not found a single distinct trace of any one of those gospels during the first century and a half after the death of Jesus" (Supernatural Religion, vol. ii, p. 248).

What was the intellectual character of the early Christians? It was quite natural that the doctrine of Jesus—that poverty is a virtue—should soon evolve the doctrine that ignorance likewise is a virtue. This it was not slow to develop. Let us see what evidence we have that the apostles and early Christians regarded ignorance as a blessing. It is to be noted, first, that Jesus attracted to himself the unlettered fishermen to be his aids, or apostles, and it would be most natural for them to imitate their master. If Jesus preached chiefly to the ignorant, it was quite natural for them to do likewise. "All these apostles were men without education and absolutely ignorant of letters and philosophy" (Mosheim, p. 27).

"Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes" (Matt. xi, 25). Very true; and most of these things remain hid from the wise and

prudent, but are clearly revealed unto the ignorant and superstitious.

"For, after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor. i, 21). This writer conscientiously confesses that preaching is foolishness, and that its blessings can be appreciated only by babes and fools.

"If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise" (1 Cor. iii, 18).

No premium is here offered for learning and the acquisition of useful knowledge. Enlightenment was more of a hinderance than a help to those striving to enter the kingdom—it always is. "For God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise." "Not many wise . . . men are called" (1 Cor. i, 26, 27).

Celsus, as quoted by Origen, describes this peculiarity of the primitive Christians thus: "Nay, we see, indeed, that even those individuals who in the market places perform disgraceful tricks, and who gather crowds about them, would never approach an assembly of wise men, nor dare exhibit their arts among them; but wherever they see young men and a mob of slaves, and a gathering of unintelligent persons, thither they thrust themselves in and show themselves off" (Origen Contra Celsus, vol. ii, p. 131).

Celsus charges that "no wise man believes the gospel, being driven away by the multitudes who adhere to it" (Ib. p. 151).

Describing this feature of gross ignorance of the Christian teacher, he says: "You may see weavers, tailors, fullers, and the most illiterate and rustic fellows, who dare not speak a word before wise men, when they can get a company of children and silly women together, set up and teach strange paradoxes among them." They are forever repeating, "Do not examine; only believe, and thy faith will make thee blessed. Wisdom is a bad thing in life; foolishness is to be preferred" (Or. Contra Celsus, vol. ii, p, 157).

If anything more were needed to prove that the original

society of Christians were excessively ignorant and superstitious, we may discover it in their tales of wonders. Indeed, their thought was not merely tainted with extravagance of imagination, but its very foundations were laid in superstition. There was nothing too incredible for their minds. They did not hesitate to give full credit to dreams, visions, revelations, talking with the angels, trances, miracles, soothsaying, miraculous conceptions, miraculous resurrections, miraculous ascensions.

Such people could believe that some doctors walking along the street could cure people with their shadows. "They brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them" (Acts v, 15). Great Peter's shade! What will not some people believe?

"We have already, in the course of these pages, seen something of the singularly credulous and uncritical character of the Fathers, and we cannot afford space to give instances of the absurdities with which their writings abound. No fable could be too gross, no invention too transparent, for their unsuspicious acceptance, if it assumed a pious form or tended to edification" (Superuatural Religon, p. 460).

What was the Moral Character of the Early Christians?

The writer from whom we have just quoted, affirms that "not many noble are called." God hath chosen the weak things and base things of the world, and things which are despised (1 Cor. i, 26–28). And this is in perfect harmony with the words of Jesus, "Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you" (Matt. xxi, 31). A strange gospel that was acceptable

to the ignorant and profligate, but which found no favor with the "wise" and "noble."

Tacitus and other writers confirm this. "There is a celebrated but disputed passage in which we read that those 'commonly known by the name of Christians, were those people who were held in abhorrence for their crimes,' that 'this pernicious superstition, though checked for a while, broke out again, and spread, not over Judea only, the source of this evil, but reached the city [Rome] also; whither flew from all quarters all things vile and shameful, and where they find shelter and encouragement."

"Tacitus reproaches them with the odious character of haters of mankind, and styles the religion of Jesus a destructive superstition; and Suetonius speaks of the Christians and their doctrine in terms of the same kind" (Mosheim, vol. i, p. 30).

Origen says: "If, therefore, he [Josephus] says the destruction of Jerusalem had befallen the Jews for the sake of James, with how much more reason might he have said that this had happened for the sake of Jesus who was the Christ, to whose divinity so many churches bear witness, who, being now recovered from the pollutions of vice, have given themselves up to the Creator, and endeavor to please him in all things" (Lardner, vol 6, p. 488).

"The Platonists and Pythagoreans held it as a maxim, that it was not only lawful but even praiseworthy to deceive, and even to use the expedient of a lie, in order to advance the cause of truth and piety. The Jews who lived in Egypt had learned and received this maxim from them before the coming of Christ, as appears incontestably from a multitude of ancient records, and the Christians were infected from both these sources with the same pernicious error, as appears from the number of books attributed falsely to great and venerable names—from the Sibylline verses and several suppositious productions which were spread abroad in this and the following century. It does not indeed seem probable that all these pious frauds were chargeable upon professors of real Chris-

tianity, upon those who entertained just and rational sentiments of the religion of Jesus. The greatest part of these fictitious writings undoubtedly flowed from the fertile invention of the Gnostic sect, that it cannot be affirmed that even true Christians were entirely innocent and irreproachable in this respect."

"As the bounderies of the Church were enlarged, the number of vicious and irregular persons who entered into it received proportional increase, as appears from the many complaints and censures that we find in the writers of this century. Several methods were practiced to stem the torrent of iniquity. Excommunication was peculiarly employed to prevent or punish the most heinous and enormous crimes; and crimes deemed such were murder, idolatry, and adultery, which terms, however, we must here understand in their more full and extensive sense" (Mosheim, vol. i, p. 65).

Suetonius, who was born about A. D. 70 and died near A. D. 123, declares of the Christians that "they were a race of men of a new and villainous, wicked, or magical superstition," and that, "Claudius drove the Jews, who, at the suggestion of Chrestus, were constantly rioting, out of Rome."

In like manner, Pliny the Younger, who was born about A. D. 60 and died about A. D. 116, accuses the Christians of "infatuation," of "contumacy and inflexible obstinacy," calls their faith "a crime," and an "austere and excessive superstition."

This immorality was not a degeneracy from original Christian purity, or a corruption of it, but was the legitimate fruit of a society professing ignorance, advocating poverty and intolerance.

For, even in the days of Paul, "The contest between the different sects had all the earnestness of a struggle between gladiators. From being warm disputants, men became dishonest, books were forged entire, others were mutilated, and some suppressed and put out of sight. It was an age of downright dishonesty on all sides. But from these dark and discordant elements arose the true Church" (Reber's Christ of Paul, p. 26).

Christianity Always was Intolerant.

From the days of Peter and Paul, there have been "contentions," "divisions," "heresies," among Christians. There were four sects, if not more, in the Church as soon as it was organized. One party said they were of Paul, and another that they were of Apollos, still others who were of Cephas, and a fourth class who were of Christ (1 Cor. i, 12).

These divisions increased at the expense of rivers of blood. The person who could hate father and mother, brother and sister and child, for Christ's sake, would not falter at the shedding of blood "for the glory of God." Hence the pathway of Christianity, wherever Christianity has had rule, has been washed with blood. Blood is *sine qua non;* "without shedding of blood there is no remission." The old monster, the object of Jewish faith, demanded blood. Blood, blood, blood. And the tap-root of our present religious intolerance may be found in that old command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." If you do have other gods, "ye shall be damned."

But how foolish for Jehovah to say, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," when there was only one God, himself, and all the rest were idols. This does not look as though an infinitely wise god uttered this command, but it bears a close resemblance to man's writings about things he does not understand.

From this unpromising origin was evolved a religion or superstition which has beclouded the path of humanity for more than eighteen centuries. If the miracles of Jesus and the apostles were left behind, yet were miracles wrought by the priests for centuries afterward. And these marvelous works were not done for a show, nor for the glory of God, but they were performed to gather together the millions of hard-

earned money from the poor, to enrich the clergy. Magnificent churches and cathedrals were reared up, proud monuments of art and, at the same time, shameful monuments of fraud and robbery.

And when miracles no longer filled the purses of the clergy, they had recourse to the sale of indulgences. For so many pounds, shillings, and pence, a monster could receive indulgence or pardon for the murder of his brother, mother, or his own child.

And this was religion! And you may say, "It is religion still," with this modification: under the papal indulgence, the fiend can get his indulgence before the act, but under the Protestant indulgence of atonement, the vilest sinner may be pardoned after the deed.

Daily, hundreds of murderers, tyrants, robbers, are sent from scaffolds and thrones and palaces to the heaven of heavens, while the sincere inquirer after truth, who has neither murdered, oppressed, nor robbed his fellows, is sent to hell because of his heresy. He was commanded to believe or be damned, and, as he could not believe what was unreasonable, he must be damned.

"But, setting all criticism aside, is there not enough superior truth in the gospel to entitle it to the veneration of mankind? Does not the spirit of charity so completely suffuse its teachings as to render it the word of love and life to the world?" Let us see. It is called the gospel, that is, good news, or glad tidings:

1. The good news is that man is a fallen being, and totally depraved. I suppose we must accept that as good news.

2. That he deserves eternal torment. Glad tidings!

3. And that nine-tenths of the human race will get their deserts—many are called but few are chosen. Glorious news!

4. That hell is in view—near at hand, and yawning for its prey. Delightful tidings!

5. That the reprobate cannot escape hell. Glorious gospel!

6. That the gods hate the most of the race, and have from all eternity doomed them to endless torment. Glorious news!

Christian Admissions Against the Scriptures.

The learned Dr. Lardner says that "even so late as the middle of the sixth century the canon of the New Testament had not been settled by any authority that was decisively and universally acknowledged; but Christian people were at liberty to judge for themselves concerning the genuineness of writings proposed to them as apostolical, and to determine according to evidence" (vol. iii, pp. 54–61).

In his second edition of his introduction to the Scriptures, the Rev. T. H. Horne says: "The account left us by ecclesiastical writers of antiquity concerning the time when the gospels were written or published are so vague, confused, and discordant that they lead to no certain or solid determination. The eldest of the ancient fathers collected the *reports* of their own times and set them down as certain truths, and those who followed adopted their accounts with implicit reverence. Thus, tradition, true or false, passed from one writer to another without examination, until, at last, it became too late to examine them to any purpose."

Dr. Whiston, speaking of the selection of the books of the New Testament, says (page 28, Exact Time): "Can any one be so weak as to imagine Mark and Luke, James and Jude—who were none of them more than companions of the apostles—to be our sacred and unerring guide, while Barnabas, Thaddeus, Clement, Timothy, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp—who were equally companions of the same apostles—to be of no authority at all?"

The Rev. J. Martineau, in his "Rationale of Religious Inquiry," says: "If we could recover the gospels of the

Hebrews and that of the Egyptians, it would be difficult to give a reason why they should not form a part of the New Testament. . . . What are Mark and Luke, who are received, more than Clement and Barnabas, who are excluded?"

Bishop Marsh observes that "it is an undoubted fact that those Christians by whom the now rejected gospels were received, and who are now called heretics, were in the right in many points of criticism where the Fathers accused them of willful corruption."

Archbishop Wake, who actually translated St. Barnabas, St. Clement, St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, and St. Hermas, Fathers of the first century, recommends them to the world as "inspired," and as "containing an authoritative declaration of the gospel of Christ to us."

And William Penn, the celebrated Quaker, in an argument against the positive acceptance of the Bible as the rule of faith and practice, says: "I demand of our adversaries, if they are well assured of those men who first collected, embodied, and declared them [the Scriptures] authentic, by a public canon, which we read was in the Council of Laodicea, held three hundred and sixty years after Christ? I say, how do they know that these men rightly discerned true from spurious? Now, sure it is that some of the Scriptures taken in by one council were rejected by another for apocryphal, and that which was left out by the former for apocryphal was taken in by the latter for canonical. Now, visible it is, that they contradict each other, and as true that they have erred respecting the present belief."

The celebrated Bishop Usher says that "our present Septuagint is a spurious copy;" and Belsham, in his "Evidence," p. 117, declares that, "of the Law of Moses, that which is genuine bears but a small proportion to that which is spurious."

PAUL.

PAUL is the chief founder of the Christian Church. Jesus organized no churches; and from his language concerning the end of the world, which was nigh at hand, and the speedy coming of the Son of man, it is clear that he had no thought of organizing churches as the method of establishing the kingdom of heaven. Saul of Tarsus, afterwards called Paul, was the principal originator of these small sects. He never saw Jesus, only in a vision. He does not build upon the knowledge he had gained from the apostles, for he consulted not with flesh and blood: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i, 11, 12); "But when it pleased God . . . to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood. Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me" (Gal. i, 15, 18); "To whom [the original apostles] we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might continue with you. But of those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person; for they who seemed to be somewhat, in conference added nothing to me" (Gal. ii, 5, 6). This high-spirited Paul was, nevertheless, willing to be made acquainted with the apostles, and introduced to them by Barnabas: "And when Paul had come to Jerusalem, he essayed to join himself to the disciples; but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him and brought

him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way" (Acts ix, 26, 27). He now meekly submits to a conference and accepts his commission to preach to the Gentiles: "And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen" (Gal. ii, 9). This looks like conferring with flesh and blood, and as though he gave place to subjection in receiving the right hands of fellowship from the apostles, and a commission therewith "that we should go unto the heathen." We find, then, that he has misrepresented the source of his apostleship and mission to the Gentiles. If further contradiction of Paul's assumption of the revelation of Jesus Christ concerning his mission to the Gentiles were necessary, it may be found in the language of Jesus to his disciples: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations" (Matt. xxviii, 19); and again: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi, 15); still further: "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts i, 8). It is evident that this language commissions all the disciples to preach to the Gentiles, and Paul's claim that he alone was set apart for that purpose is false.

But we have read that when Barnabas took him to the disciples at Jerusalem, he "declared unto them how he [Paul] had seen the Lord in the way." Paul never claimed to have seen Jesus in the flesh, but that he had seen him in a vision, and he also speaks of it as "when it pleased God . . . to reveal his Son in me." His knowledge of Jesus came through visions and revelations, and not by ordinary acquaintance and fellowship. He never specifies when, where, or who was with him when he saw Jesus, but in general terms, "As I went to Damascus." He continues the account of his seeing Jesus thus: "At midday, O king, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about

me and them which journeyed with me. And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? . . . And I said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" (Acts xxvi, 13–15). All this he calls a vision: "Whereupon, O king Agrippi, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision" (idem. 19).

Paul was intensely arrogant: "For I speak to you, Gentiles, . . . I magnify mine office" (Rom. xi, 13), "Wherefore, I beseech you, be ye followers of me" (1 Cor. iv, 16).

"To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes, forgave I it in the person of Christ" (2 Cor. ii, 10).

"If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed" (2 Thess. iii, 14).

As a teacher, Paul was intolerant and vindictive. His conceit had much to do with this overbearing spirit he everywhere manifests. He preaches well of charity, but succeeds poorly in reducing it to practice. He doubtless would reply to such a charge, "I could easier teach twenty what were good to be done, than be one of the twenty to follow my own teaching" (Merchant of Venice). He reminded the Corinthians that he "was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles" (2 Cor. xi, 5): "I say again, Let no man think me a fool; if otherwise, yet as a fool receive me, that I may boast myself a little" (xi, 16); "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I. Are they members of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more" (xi, 22–23); I am become a fool in glorifying; ye have compelled me, . . . for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles" (2 Cor. xii, 16).

Before his conversion, Paul had been a bitter, cruel, and murderous partizan, and after his conversion he cherished the same spirit. He had been a party to the murder of Stephen, but now since he has met with so great a change, he lets his

enemies off with a cursing, and hopes they may smoke for it in the next world: "Alexander, the coppersmith, did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works" (2 Tim. iv, 14). Of those who spoke slanderously against him, he said their "damnation is just" (Rom. iii, 8). If any others preached the gospel according to their belief in it, he said, "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (Gal. i, 9); "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema, Maran-atha" (1 Cor. xvi, 22).

The new man Paul is as bitter, arrogant, and domineering as was Saul of Tarsus. There was a change of names, but no change of nature.

He was intent upon making proselytes, even if in so doing he should be forced to make principle bend to policy. He boasts of this duplicity and time-serving spirit: "And unto the Jews, I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law. To them that are without the law, as without the law. . . . To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak; I am made all things to all men" (1 Cor. ix, 20–22). In this professing to be all things to all men, he became hypocritical. That he might gain favor with some, he pretended to set aside the Mosaic law, and declared that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified" (Rom. iii, 20); "Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, That if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing" (Gal. v, ii); and yet he could circumcise Timothy, "Because of the Jews which were in those quarters" (Acts xvi, 3).

On one occasion, as related in Acts (xxi), he agreed to dissemble and make it appear that he "walked orderly" and "kept the law." His deception, however, did not succeed, for there were many who came into the temple who knew him as a repudiator of the law, and so they "took Paul and drew him out of the temple" (Acts xxi, 30). Alluding to his achievements in the art of proselyting, he says to the Corinthians (2, xii, 16), "Nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you

with guile." "The end justifies the means," was the policy according to which he regulated his practice. Policy, craft, and guile were not all he could do; he could lie for his own cause and then justify it: "For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory, why yet am I also judged as a sinner? And not rather (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say), Let us do evil that good may come" (Rom. iii, 7, 8).

The report, whether slanderous or not, undoubtedly was true, as we have seen from the practice of Paul of becoming all things to all men, and of being crafty, and catching the Corinthians with guile. He was a zealot, and was not over scrupulous of the means he used in making converts to his doctrines. The paramount thing with him was partisan success.

Of his doctrines of election and reprobation, of the fall of man in Adam, and the restoration or salvation of all men through Jesus, of the resurrection, immortality, and a general judgment day, and other doctrines, it is not necessary to speak; but to some of his rules which were to be observed by the churches, we may call attention.

Paul does not heartily approve of marriage. It is true that at one time he said, "Marriage is honorable in all" (Heb. xiii, 4); yet it is a common thing for him to disparage it by indirect reflections upon it: "I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I" (1 Cor. vii, 8). "For I would that all men were even as I, myself" [unmarried] (1 Cor. vii, 7), "Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife" (1 Cor. viii, 27). At one time he speaks of it as allowable for widows to marry again: "If her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will" (1 Cor. vii, 39); and on another occasion he says: "But the younger widows refuse; for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; having damnation because they have cast off their first faith" (1 Tim. v, 11, 12). His decisions are not impartial, but generally are adverse to woman and in favor of

man. The equality of husband and wife, with their equal rights and privileges, was never dreamed of by him. Woman was in every way inferior and in subjection to man. He was to rule over her, and, as a good wife, her paramount duty was to obey him.

"Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." Great heavens! listen to the reason he gives for the abject subjection of woman: "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression" (1 Tim. ii, 13, 14).

Upon this old, self-contradictory, and absurd tradition of the origin of man, he bases the right to enslave woman to her husband. His opinion, indeed, could be passed over as a trifling matter had not millions of women been compelled to a servitude frequently more bitter than chattel slavery. The enormity of wrong inflicted upon woman in consequence of the tyrannical teaching of this man, Saul of Tarsus, the world shall never know. A very large part of her wrongs in the present day may be attributed to his writings: "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience. . . And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (1 Cor. xiv, 34, 35).

The husband was lord and master of his wife: "Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord; for the husband is the head [master] of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church. . . Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be [subject] to their own husbands in everything" (Ephes. v, 22–24)! "I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ, and the head [master] of the woman is the man" (1 Cor. xi, 3).

And nowhere in his epistles does he uphold woman as the equal of man: "For a man indeed ought not to cover his

head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man" (1 Cor. xi, 7); and yet the tradition from which he gets his knowledge of the creation of man, expressly declares that both man and woman were made in the image of God: "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he them; male and female created he them" (Gen. i, 27).

"Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman [was created] for the man" (1 Cor. xi, 9). This makes it all plain. Woman was made to be a slave for the lord of creation. In the light of this gospel we can readily understand how it happened heretofore, and even now among rude people, that woman has been hitched up alongside of an ox or an ass and made to draw the plow. She was created for the man, and he of necessity must use her wherever she can be of service to him. And all this diabolism has been for eighteen hundred years called "inspiration!" "The word of the Lord," "The word of life." Happily for the present age there are many who have a better inspiration and a nobler word of life.

In keeping with this spirit of oppression of woman is his approval of caste and submission to tyranny, and slavery: "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called" (1 Cor. vii, 20).

To obey this would be to check every laudable ambition, and stay all progress of man and society. The very reverse of this contains more truth: "Let every man strive to rise above his present condition."

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God" (Rom. xiii, 1). If our forefathers had obeyed this scripture, we would not now have our present republican government. This passage has been a gigantic club in the hands of tyrants and monsters, with which they have beaten the common people into the dust, into slavish service where they have cringed in poverty, ignorance, and misery. But among people who believe that "the powers that be are ordained of God" (idem.), there is no

great progress, and invariably the condition of the common people is but little above that of serfs and slaves. If any are in a state of slavery, they are advised to abide in their condition: "Let as many servants [slaves] as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor" (1 Tim. vi, 1). "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters, according to the flesh, with fear and trembling" (Ephes. vi, 5).

An outline of Paul's character and career will not produce a very flattering picture of him. He began his public life by consenting and becoming accessory to the murder of Stephen: "And many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them" (Acts xxvi, 10).

Some time afterwards he became converted in a marvelous way, and assumed apostleship and a mission to preach to the Gentiles.

"Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God" (Cor. i, 1), "Paul, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father" (Gal. i, 1), "For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (idem. i, 12). He had a vision or dream, and upon the strength of it he changed his conduct from "entering into every house; and haling men and women," and committing them to prison, and now, by preaching, he drew men and women into his churches, and if they refused to obey him he pronounced horrid imprecations upon them, and assured them that their damnation was just.

Very early in his career as an independent gospeler, his preaching contributed to the growing schisms of the Church. There were four or more small sects; some of Paul, others of Apollos, a third party of Cephas, and still another of Christ. But Paul's party was the one which preserved and perpetuated all the truth; and so he turns bitterly upon those other Christian sects and says: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that

which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." He has not modified his bitter, persecuting spirit; he is the same relentless foe to all who oppose him.

He was equally intense in his self-conceit and boastfulness; he was not a "whit behind the very chiefest apostles." He claimed to be a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and might, with still greater propriety, have confessed that he was a bigoted partizan of all bigoted partizans. His great endeavor is to get followers, and so he becomes all things to all men, that he may make proselytes. To dissemble and lie were justifiable if they contributed to the glory of God.

His notions of marriage; of the relations between man and woman, and their equal rights, duties, and privileges; of the duty of men to struggle for higher conditions and relations in life; of the obligation of those under the heel of oppression to rise and overthrow the tyrant, or at least escape from his cruelty and power—of those great truths, the thirteenth apostle, who was born out of due time, seems to be totally ignorant. The common sense people of the nineteenth century are assured that his teachings and stories are out of "due time" now. As fabulous, we relegate them, with ten thousand other stories, to regions of mythology.

PAULINISM VERSUS JESUISM.

"PAUL was born in Tarsus, in Cilicia, a city renowned for Grecian culture, of which Paul, however, had not even a smattering. When quite a young man, he came to Jerusalem to receive the higher theological training, and was said to have been a pupil of Gamaliel the elder. According to the Jewish customs of those days, his theological pursuits did not relieve him from the obligation of learning a trade; he was a tent-maker, or rather weaver of that coarse tent-cloth called *cilicium*. In Jerusalem he soon showed his inborn fanaticism by seeking distinction in the persecution of the harmless followers of Jesus, who were called Nazarenes."

"Let the reader imagine that he is in Jerusalem, . . . about the year A. D. 34. There is unusual tumult in the vicinity of the Temple. A large crowd has gathered, and, stirred up by some strong provocation, is swayed like the billows in a storm. As we approach we see a young man who is trying to raise his voice above the din. There is something very striking in his looks. He is pale, but firm. His eyes gleam with an unearthly light. As the crowd surges and threatens, he is calm. His thoughts and looks are directed more to heaven than earth. But in this crowd there is a young man of an entirely different stamp. He is excited and angry. His eyes are red with rage, and he is seen moving among the crowd like an incendiary. The crisis came, and poor Stephen stood first on the list of Christian martyrs. This little blear-eyed, angry man is not quite satisfied. Like the tiger that has tasted blood, he thirsts for more. He goes about Jerusalem like a madman. He fills the prisons with men and women who believed with Stephen." "By his exertions mainly they were scattered from Jerusalem along

the coast of Phœnicia, Syria, and Cilicia. But Paul's fanaticism had no rest; he heard that those scattered from Jerusalem were gathering in the Grecian cities, and he obtained letters from the high priest to the heads of the various synagogues, by which he was authorized to take all Nazarenes, wherever found, and deliver them to the court of Jerusalem, the highest court in religious matters. With these letters he went to Damascus, but before he entered this city a sudden change came over him." "On his way, while he is breathing out threatenings and slaughter, he is struck down in his mad career . . . Everything is changed in a moment." "He had a vision of the crucified Jesus, and henceforth became as zealous and fanatical in the propagation of the new doctrine as formerly he was in its persecution." "The fiery stream of burning lava which had rushed in one direction, now turned and ran with equal violence the other way."

"Of this vision the Acts give us three contradictory versions (ix, 3 ff.; xxii, 6 ff.; xxvi, 12 ff.), according to which a light from heaven, brighter than the sun, suddenly shone round about him, and a conversation between him and an apparition took place. The legendary nature of these relations is obvious; the words of Jesus, in one relation, are put into the mouth of Ananias in the other; here the companions of Paul remain standing, there they fall to the ground; in one relation they hear the voice, but see nothing; in the other they see the light, but hear nothing. His own version of this event is simple enough (Gal. i, 12 ff.; 1 Cor. xv, 8; ix, 1). He saw Jesus just as all the other apostles had seen him. This gives us a clearer idea of what the apostles have seen, and what the apparitions of the resurrected Jesus were."

We have it in evidence that Paul was weak-bodied, continually complaining of his ailments, especially of one, which must have been very annoying to him, to wit, "the thorn in his flesh, the messenger of Satan that buffeted him," whatever that might have been. Such ailments and such hardships and fatigues as he imposed upon himself could only be withstood

and battled against by his irrepressibly volcanic spirit. But for this immense strain he had to pay the dire penalty in the wrack and ruin of his nervous system, which made him subject to trances and hallucinations, of which he often speaks; for instance (2 Cor. xii, 2 ff.): "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I cannot tell, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth), how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." This was the man who had traveled through the desert eight days from Jerusalem, and was now approaching the outskirts of Damascus, the beautiful. There he had to resume his cruel work of persecution. All the way thither his mind was, of course, occupied with the victims of his rage—the poor Jesuists who believed Jesus to be the Messiah. Of Jesus himself he knew but next to nothing—no more, probably, than he had learned from the exclamations and confessions of those he had persecuted. "He had seen the joyful sufferings of those who persevered, and heard the recantations which those weaker ones had uttered with trembling lips and agony of mind. He had probably witnessed similar visions of some of his victims, who, in the midst of their suffering, were so carried away by their ecstacy and wrought-up imagination that they saw the heavens open and the resurrected Christ come down with the clouds of the sky, as the Acts (vii, 56) tell us of Stephen. Pondering over all these experiences, his excited brain, wearied nerves, and heated imagination created the same vision; he saw the crucified Jesus whom he persecuted, and at once his passionate soul was thrown into the opposite direction. He came to Damascus, not as a new man, but with a new faith and new convictions, for which he would do battle with the same energy and the same fiery spirit as he did for the old. Without conversing with any of the apostles, or taking advice from any of the adherents of Jesus, he at once entered upon his new career of preaching the gospel of the resurrected Christ (Messiah), as he understood it, according to his knowledge of the Scriptures and the Jewish

traditions. That the gospel of Jesus and his disciples was quite different from his own was nothing to him."

How different from and even antagonistic to the Jesuism of Peter and the apostles was this new gospel of Paul will further plainly appear from the following able presentation, drawn from the same clear source whence we have already so abundantly availed ourselves:

"The disciples of Jesus always held, as did Jesus himself, that the most faithful compliance with the laws of God, as taught by Judaism, was the only preparation for the world that was soon to come by some wonderful divine interposition; then all the concomitant circumstances that were to accompany the time of the Messiah, according to the Jewish traditions—as for instance, the conversion of all nations to the belief in God—were likewise, by some miraculous powers, to be brought about. In the meantime, Judaism had to be vigorously observed, together with those preparatory doctrines divulged by Jesus. But Paul was not the man to go for instruction to these simple fishermen; he was not to be influenced by any teacher. Jesus had appeared to him just as he had appeared to others, especially to the apostles; he had his revelations and visions, and these he was to preach. 'Jesus is the Messiah; he was innocently put to death; he has risen again, and will soon return to introduce the world to come.' This was all he knew and wanted to know of Jesus; and it was quite sufficient for him to found a new religion on these premises. . . . With these glad tidings, he addressed himself to the Gentiles, who, after the appearance of the Messiah, were all to accept the Jewish religious and moral ideas. But the laws and institutions historically connected with, and, to a Jewish mind, inseparable from, these ideas had no meaning to the heathen; they were a yoke too heavy to be borne. Paul, brought up among the heathen, knew this better than anybody else; and, fortunately, according to the theory that Jesus was the Messiah, the laws were superfluous. Jewish tradition had it that, with the appearance of the Messiah, all laws and institutions would cease. The laws and institutions,

therefore, were abolished, and there was no hindrance for receiving the Gentiles into the bosom of the new faith without burdening them with the laws." He continued his preaching and work in Damascus and Arabia, in Tarsus and Antioch, which latter place was the real cradle of Christianity—a name soon adopted by the faithful themselves.

After taking his famous "new departure," Paul, in company with Barnabas, departed from Antioch (about A. D. 45) on an extensive mission to the Gentiles. They traversed the Island of Cyprus, from which they passed into Asia Minor, and Paul preached a memorable sermon at Antioch in Pisidia. Though violently persecuted, they converted many at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, and returned in A. D. 47 to Antioch in Syria, where they abode a long time. In the course of a second apostolic journey he founded churches at Philippi and Thessalonica, and uttered a remarkable discourse at Athens. He also made many converts at Corinth, where he remained a year and a half, and whence, it is supposed, he wrote a letter to the Thessalonians. Space will not allow us to follow Paul in all his travels. Suffice it to say that he was accused of teaching another gospel; he was declared a heretic, and his converts were told, "except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." After long disputes, however, a compromise was agreed upon between Paul and the original apostles, viz., Paul should be received and acknowledged as apostle of the heathen, who might remain free of the law, and be considered "proselytes of the gate;" the disciples of Jesus, however, would continue to labor as apostles of the Jews, for whom the law remained valid and binding. But such an expedient could not be otherwise than very unsatisfactory. Indeed, in time, "Paul and his gospel, still further liberalized, became most intensely abhorred; he is represented as Balaam, the seducer of the people; and other not very flattering epithets are given to him. This opposition among the Jew-Christians he has to explain to himself and his congregations; the easiest way of explaining it is, 'they are blinded.' . . . Thus we have

the rejection of Israel as a people, and the election of the Gentiles, as many of them as will believe. Christianity has abandoned her mother, and thrown herself without reserve upon the heathen world. Henceforth her language is no longer Hebrew or Chaldean, no longer the language of Jesus, but Greek and Latin. The influence of heathenism, the consequence of Paul's doctrines, may be resisted yet a while by the handful of Jew-Christians; but in the course of time they will have to yield. Heathenism more and more absorbs the new religion; and those truths brought over from Judaism are soon lost sight of, for they are swept away or buried under the deluge of paganism."

THE EARLY CHURCH.

ITS CORRUPTIONS.

It is said that Saint Barnabas, an apostle of the second order, among his other writings, left as a legacy to coming generations the following singular prophecy concerning the future ages of the Church: "It shall enter upon an oblique path, the road of eternal death and punishment; the vices which lose souls shall appear; idolatry, audacity, pride, hypocrisy, duplicity of heart, adultery, incest, apostasy, magic [whatever that may mean], avarice, murder, shall be the portion of its ministers; they will become the corrupters of the works of God, the adorers of the rich, the oppressors of the poor."

Of course this prophecy is purely apocryphal, written by somebody long after the days of Barnabas, as well as after the event. It only shows how an observer of the morals of the Church observed rightly, but still—for the sake of pious fraud, which is dearer even to the otherwise moral ecclesiastic than the apple of his eye—committed his observation to writing under the semblance of a prophecy of holy Barnabas. It is an old trick, in vogue from the time the five books of the Pentateuch—written after the so-called Babylonian captivity—were named after an impossible primeval Moses, down to the time when the canonical and most of the apocryphal gospels, and many of the epistles, were fraudulently named after as impossible gospelers and holy letter-writers; and thence down, through all the legends of the Church even to the present day, so prolific in miracles, miracle-plays, and miracle-cures, and other incorrigible frauds so dear to the faithful and profitable to the priest.

But be that as it may, the above prophecy according to St. Barnabas is an over-true tale of the morals of the Church almost from its very foundation.

Take, for instance, the avarice of the early clergy. One of the most distinguished writers of the last century said that the presents made to churches were not employed to succor those in need, but the priests, regarding themselves as the first poor, absorbed the immense revenues—a revolting abuse, which should have been repressed with severity. The rascality of the priests also at an early date multiplied relics in order to extort offerings from the faithful. They likewise before long forgot their fastings and became beastly gourmands; though it was well for them that they had not become all this as early as the reign of the Emperor Commodus, the handsomest and most cruel of men, who, among the other horrors of his cruelty, when he met corpulent citizens caused them to be split in the middle by a single blow, and delighted in seeing their entrails escape through the gaping wound. Evidently the later priests and monks, so gross and fat, could not escape death under such a peril, unless they observed more rigorously the fasts prescribed by their rules.

It is a generally admitted truth that the best and wisest laws are corrupted whenever they grant too much power to a single individual. The institution of the Episcopate—especially the Roman—offers us a striking proof of this. The high dignity of pontiff changed the spirit of those who were clothed with it, inspired them with pride, and so flattered their ambition that they soon regarded themselves as far superior to other ministers of religion. Above all, as we have already intimated, we remark this change at Rome, as if this mistress of the world could suffer none within her bosom but princes and kings. So the bishops of the holy city commenced, toward the close of the second century, to claim for themselves a jurisdiction over other churches; and in the third had already abandoned all the precepts of humility enjoined on them, and become rampant tyrants. Corruption increased, and the despotism of the clergy weighed down the people.

St. Victor (A. D. 194–202) had prepared the way for the dominion of the pontiff, and his successors did not neglect on any occasion to extend their power.

The origin of temporalities in churches is deduced from this bishop; it is said that he appropriated to the wants of the clergy the goods and lands which Christians offered to him, and divided the revenues proportionably to the labors of the ministers of religion. But the usage was soon changed. The priests who performed their duty the most carefully were the worst paid, whilst bishops and archbishops became the corrupt possessors of immense wealth, for which they compensated the world with supine indolence and shameful licentiousness.

The charlatanism of the priests in the very first ages of Christianity was as bad and as damnable as that of the writers of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. The chroniclers relate a wonderful story of a Cappadocian woman of the early part of the third century who was possessed of a devil, and who counterfeited the part of a prophetess. She seduced, by false miracles, many of the faithful, who regarded her as a saint. A priest and a deacon were even carried away by her delusions. She had the boldness to baptize and administer the eucharist with the same ceremonies which were observed in the Church. But a man of great piety publicly maintained that the woman was possessed of a devil, and by his prayers drove out of her the demon Ashtaroth, who escaped, vomiting fire upon the assembled people. What a grand story; in other words, what stuff for holy gullibility and the up-building of priestcraft!

Christian anchorites and hermits have been extravagantly praised by the Catholic Church for their superior saintliness. It is well to know their origin. Let us see. A young Christian of Alexandria, named Paul, the heir of a rich patrimony, had retired to one of his estates, in order to live far from the world, with his brother-in-law and a young sister, for whom he had conceived a violent passion. But one day his brother-in-law, having detected him in incest, threatened to surrender

him to the commissioners of the emperor. Affrighted by the threat, Paul fled to the solitude of the mountains, where he recovered, little by little, tranquillity of mind. His tears having softened the justice of God, he had a dream, in which an angel appeared to him, who promised him pardon for his crime on condition that he would pass his life in solitude. The next day, on awakening, Paul decided to follow the divine inspiration. He climbed a hill which he found in his path; arriving at the top, he perceived a great cavern, closed by a stone; he penetrated it, from curiosity, and found in the interior a spacious apartment, open to the day, and shaded by a venerable palm tree, which extended its protecting branches over all the grotto. A limpid fountain bubbled forth from the foot of the rock, and having flowed some paces onward, lost itself in a mazy winding formed by two blocks of granite. Paul chose this place for his retreat, and lived there ninety years, although he was already thirty-three at the time of his flight from Alexandria. A fine beginning for a Christian hermitism! Because a young fellow could not keep himself from committing the vile crime of incest, therefore a great institution of anchorite monkery must, forsooth, be set up, specially sanctioned by the Church and eulogized by the faithful, thus endorsing isolated worthlessness, and, in too many cases, all along the centuries, glorifying idleness, ignorance, uncleanness, and all forms of disgusting vice.

We have all heard of St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. He flourished about the year 253. His treatise on morals is rigorous in regard to ecclesiastical discipline, which shows that the clergy had already become tainted with gross immorality. Quite a curious story, bearing on the great social question of that day, is related of him. A bishop, it seems, consulted him by letter whether he should bestow the communion on holy females who, having taken the vow of virginity, pretended to exercise themselves in conquering the spirit of evil by sharing their beds with young priests and deacons. Cyprian replied that if they had, in truth, preserved their virginity, he should not refuse them communion; but that it

would be better that they should not in future renew so dangerous a proof, in order to shun scandal. Does not this give us a telling glimpse of the ecclesiastical free-love and spiritual wifehood prevailing in those early days?

And how the clergy quarreled during the very golden age of much-vaunted primitive Christianity, just as they have continued to do ever since. The pontiff Stephen I. called even Saint Cyprian by very bad names indeed. He designated him as a false Christ, a false prophet, a fraudulent workman; and, in order not to be understood as speaking from himself, had the audacity to reproach him in the name of others. To which holy Cyprian replies, reproaching the pontiff with being arrogant, obstinate, the enemy of Christians, the defender of heretics, preferring human traditions to divine inspiration. Thus, in those good old times of Christianity pure and undefiled, holy men mingled in their disputes that sharpness and bitterness which we always find in religious contests. And in those times, also, the unenlightened people embraced with fury the opinions of their bishops, and thousands upon thousands perished to maintain the errors and ambitions of miserable priests.

As early as the year 283, the pontiff ordained that a pagan or a heretic should not accuse a Christian. However powerless such a rule may have been then, it plainly shows the spirit of Christian bigotry, which in later times flashed forth in violent and cruel persecutions.

We have heard a great deal of the persecution of the Christians by Diocletian. In ingenuity and heartlessness of torture it was indeed terrible, and history will ever rightly point to it as one of the most cruel carnages that ever took place. But what was the main cause of it? Listen to Eusebius. After describing the great success of the Church in making proselytes and acquiring wealth and honors, a little previous to the persecution, he says: "But too great liberty caused a relaxation of discipline; . . . the bishops, animated the one against the other, excited quarrels and disorders; at length, when falsehood and deceit were carried to the utmost

excess, divine justice lifted its arm to punish, and permitted that the faithful, who had entered upon the profession of arms, should be the first to be persecuted. Still, they remained in a culpable insensibility; instead of appeasing the anger of God, they added crimes to crimes; the priests despising the rules of piety, contended and quarreled among themselves, fomented enmities and hatred, and disputed for the first place in secular affairs. . . . ."

Such was the corruption of the ecclesiastics toward the end of the third century. "Since that period, the derelictions of the clergy have increased in an arithmetical, though it may be refined, ratio. The priests have shown themselves virtually always the same—always avaricious, ambitious, debauchers, proud, vindictive, always enemies of repose and true morality, always dissimulators." Such at least was the opinion of Platinus; and that which we see in our day fully convinces us of the truth of these accusations.

During the Diocletian period, Pope Marcellinus, the very shepherd of the faithful flock, solemnly abjured the Christian religion. Authors affirm that, according to the best testimony, he offered incense to idols in the temples of Isis and Vesta, in the presence of many of the faithful, in order to induce them to imitate the example of cowardice which he set them. They add that the council which afterwards assembled at Sienna to judge the pope dared not condemn him. The bishops at the synod simply said to him, "Condemn yourself by your own mouth, but you will not be excommunicated by our judgment." Was not this a fair sample, sixteen hundred years ago, of the ecclesiastical calcimining which has constantly been taking place ever since, on a smaller scale, all over this broad land of ours, as well as throughout Europe?

Most Protestants will have it that during the first two or three centuries of the Christian era the faithful believed in no doctrine and practiced no ceremony that is now distinctively Catholic. But that is not the case, by any means. We shall here mention only one or two examples. Early in the

second century even they adopted the custom of praying for the dead; and, according to Tertullian, the prayers were preceded by many signs of the cross. Holy water was also instituted in the first quarter of the second century, as well as unleavened bread for the communion, and the admixture of water with wine in the chalice for the celebration of the mass. In the first ages, also, a public confession was exacted. The Grecian and Eastern churches appointed a penitential priest, who compelled the culpable to remain without the gates of the church, mourning, clothed in sackcloth, and on their knees. Fasts of several years were imposed, according to the magnitude of their sins. What say our Protestant friends to all this? We are strongly inclined to believe that instead of this ceremonial of public confession being a corruption, it was a very wholesome custom, and would work well even now-a-days in many places.

In those primitive times, also, as already intimated, the bishops of the principal sees unjustly arrogated to themselves superiority over those of the same country, and sometimes over those of several provinces, when these were dependent on the great cities. The bishops of Rome, especially—we may as well, with Catholic authors, call them popes at once, even in those early days—put on very high pretensions; and the cowardice of the magistrates only rendered too real their imaginary rights of jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal.

Soon after the death of the pontiff Marcellinus, the persecution of Diocletian commenced to subside in Italy and Africa. After its termination, instead of its being a lesson, inculcating purity and peace with the Church, we immediately find the bishops of Numidia elevating to the see of the Numidian capital a bishop celebrated in ecclesiastical history for his debaucheries and his incests.

We need not say what all serious historians think of the silly story of St. Helena and the true cross. During the pontificate of Eusebius, about the year 310, it is said that this lady, the mother of Constantine the Great, went, at the advanced age of eighty, into Palestine, caused excavations to

be made at Jerusalem, and found "the cross on which the Savior of the world had suffered." But how many hundred wagon-loads of true crosses have been adored since that great discovery!

The acts of the martyrs, during the first years of the fourth century, are filled with miraculous legends of confessors and saints who suffered martyrdom; but the uniformity of the narratives deserves attention. There is always a Christian resisting the most frightful punishments, and finishing by being beheaded, or thrown to wild beasts. Then, the pagans always wish to annihilate the body, and the faithful always, through the particular intervention of God, carry it off, unharmed by fire or water, in order to make relics of it. This is only a continuation of the pious fraud of Paul and the earliest Fathers, and a prophecy of that of the great liar Eusebius, looming in the immediate future, as well as of the succeeding Fathers, scholastics, Jesuits, and priests down to the present day.

At or about the advent of Constantine the Great we enter upon a vast career, less obscure than that of the preceding ages. History will lighten up, with her sublime torch, the enormous crimes and scandalous debaucheries which we shall find on the chair of the popes.

Constantine had been providing, for a long time, the means to mount the throne, and, constitutional hypocrite as he was, his policy rendered him favorable to Christianity, because Christianity had by this time become powerful in Rome. He yielded to the entreaties of Pope Melchiades to come and combat the tyrant Maxentius, and his army marched on Milan. His first act of power was to make an edict in favor of the Christian religion; but, at the same time, fair play to his name, he left to the pagans the free exercise of their ceremonies, "because," said he, "I have learned that religion should be free; and that each one should be left to worship God as he judges proper." So, whatever may be said of the previous and subsequent hypocrisy and other manifest bad qualities of Constantine, we may safely call him the first

great free religionist in all Christian history. The ecclesiastical policy at and before that time—indeed, during the apostles' time, and almost ever after—had been to force men, for love of their dear souls, to worship contrary to their convictions. The popes had been all along putting in use these execrable means which they employed in the succeeding ages with audacious tyranny.

In the great Donatic controversy, which commenced raging about this time, we see Cecilian, a priest who had been chosen bishop of Carthage, opposed by a party of deacons, who had received in deposit the vessels of this church during the persecution. These unworthy fellows, hoping to divide among themselves these rich spoils, raised altar against altar. Two candidates for the pontificate, enraged at not having been chosen to fill the see, joined them, and drew into their party a lady of illustrious birth, named Lucilla. Women always give a great impulse to all the plots which are formed, in Church or State. Lucilla was rich, beautiful, surrounded by numerous friends. For a long time her conduct had brought scandal upon the Church. This woman was anxiously desirous to be avenged on Cecilian, who had reproved her, in a full assembly, for her levity and vices. The three parties, united, formed a powerful faction, which declared against Cecilian, and refused to communicate with him. And, last but not least, seventy bishops seconded their designs. Having assembled in council at Carthage, they condemned Cecilian, because he had refused to appear before them to justify himself; because he had been ordained by traitors; and lastly, because he had hindered the faithful from taking provisions to the martyrs, who were imprisoned during the last persecution. After this decision, the Fathers, regarding the see of Carthage as vacant, proceeded to a new election, and ordained thereto a man named Majorin, a domestic of Lucilla. Such was the origin of the Donatist schism. Donatus, who succeeded Majorin as anti-bishop of Carthage, was subsequently condemned, at a Lateran synod, as the author of most of the scandals against Cecilian, the regular bishop; and was

also convicted of great crimes, by his own confession. The other bishops were confirmed in their dignities and permitted to return to their sees, though they had been ordained by the schismatic Majorin. In spite of the condemnation which they had encountered, the Donatists persevered in their schism. They boldly complained of the council of Rome, affirming that the judges had been corrupted by Cecilian: and even in the time of St. Augustine they accused Pope Melchiades of having delivered up the sacred books to the pagans, and of having offered incense to the idols.

Behold, how these pure early Christians loved one another!

CLEMENT OF ROME.

The earliest Christian writer, after the apostolic age, is generally supposed to be Clement of Rome; and therefore his name occupies a prominent position in Church literature. But there is no contemporaneous history of the man or his writings, and hence, although a vast amount has been written about him and his writings in later times, almost nothing is known of him or them. In the absence of historic records, Milman characterizes the period as the "age of total obscurity," and of the earlier bishops of Rome, he says that they "are known only by barren lists, by spurious decrees and epistles.

There are two epistles accredited to Clement, though his name does not appear in either of them, but is added at the end of the first in the only manuscript extant, the Alexandrian, which is assigned to the fifth century. The second epistle, which by the way is not an epistle, but a homily, is not mentioned by the earlier fathers, who refer to the first, and Eusebius, who is the first writer who mentions it, expresses doubt regarding it, while Jerome and Photius state that it was rejected by the ancients; and modern criticism has relegated it and the homilies and recognitions to the limbo of spurious writings.

Great uncertainty prevails as to the date at which the first epistle was written. There are strong reasons for believing that it was written about the end of the first century. But at whatever date it may have been written, there can be no doubt that it is much interpolated, as it was a common custom of those days to mend the writings which one read by inscribing marginal or interlineary remarks on them, and the first epistle suffered in this way.

Another and most important fact connected with this epistle is that it contains no evidence of the existence of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The writer never refers to any written record, but merely repeats words of the Lord Jesus which were floating about in traditions.

As a specimen of his faith and intelligence, we copy the following story: "Let us consider that wonderful sign [of the resurrection] which takes place in Eastern lands, that is, in Arabia and the countries round about. There is a certain bird, which is called a phœnix. This is the only one of its kind, and lives five hundred years; and when the time of its dissolution draws near, that it must die, it builds itself a nest of frankincense and myrrh and other spices, into which, when the time is fulfilled, it enters and dies. But as the flesh decays, a certain kind of worm is produced, which being nourished by the juices of the dead bird, brings forth feathers: then, when it has acquired strength, it takes up that nest in which are the bones of its parent, and, bearing them, it passes from the land of Arabia into Egypt, to the city called Heliopolis. And in open day, flying in sight of all men, it places them on the altar of the sun; and having done this, it hastens back to its former abode. The priest then inspects the register of the dates, and finds that it has returned exactly as the five hundredth year was completed."

Now, if this story may be attributed to Clement, we cannot venerate his wisdom; and if it be an interpolation, it prevents us from knowing which is and which is not his writing, and it also gives us a picture of the superstitions of the age, and the unscrupulousness with which they devised epistles and gospels, and ascribed them to those who were reputed apostles, and their companions.

IGNATIUS.

We have no trustworthy history of Ignatius, and the only thing relating to him which amounts to the probability of fact is the conclusion, reached by criticism rather than by historical statement, that he died in December, A. D. 115. He was condemned to be cast to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Rome in consequence of the fanatical excitement produced by an earthquake which lasted seven days, and in which the emperor came near losing his life. The superstition of the people was so great that it was necessary to sacrifice Ignatius to appease the wrath of the gods. There are no less than three martyrologies of Ignatius, giving an account of his journey from Antioch to Rome, but they are all recognized to be mere idle legends, of whose existence we do not hear till a very late period.

There are fifteen epistles which are ascribed to him, but of these, eight are now universally considered spurious. Of the seven other, there are two Greek versions, a longer and a shorter. Both cannot be authentic, and Dr. Lardner doubts the genuineness of either, while other rigidly orthodox critics reject them altogether.

In 1843 a still shorter ancient Syriac version was made, which sets aside the Greek versions. For if Ignatius was a Syrian, why should he write in Greek? The writings confute themselves in their contradictory accounts. Ignatius describes his journey to Rome after this manner: "From Syria even to Rome I fight with wild beasts, by sea and by land, by night and by day; being bound amongst ten leopards, which are a band of soldiers; who, even when good is done to them, rendered evil."

But notwithstanding the bitter enmity of those who are conducting him hurriedly to Rome, he has time and opportunity afforded to write many long epistles, in which he enters minutely into dogmatic teaching and expresses the most advanced views regarding ecclesiastical government. This seems unaccountable when we consider that he had, according to his own showing, just had opportunities to address his counsels in person to those communities and individuals. Why should he write to them, or how could he find opportunity to do so if his escort were ten leopards, "who, even when good is done them, rendered evil"? It is impossible to conceive of epistles being written under such circumstances; for if he was condemned for professing Christianity, it is not at all probable that the "ten leopards" would allow him to write long epistles at every stage of his journey promulgating the very doctrines for which he was so soon to be thrown to the wild beasts at Rome. Moreover, if we may believe these epistles, Ignatius had perfect liberty to see his friends. He received bishops, deacons, and members of various Christian communities, who came with greetings and accompanied him on his journey. At Smyrna he met Polycarp, who was then bishop of that city, and at his hands received a grand reception, and afterwards wrote an epistle to the church at Rome. He landed next at Troas, where three more epistles purport to have been written. From Troas he sailed to Neopolis, in Macedonia, and thence he was conducted afoot through Macedonia to the Adriatic Sea, a distance of about three hundred miles. At Philippi, on this circuitous overland route, three of the eight so-called spurious epistles, it seems, were written. The remainder of the journey was made by sea. Reaching Rome on the last day of the public spectacles, Ignatius was hastily thrown to the wild beasts and devoured, and "only the harder portions of his holy remains were left, which were conveyed to Antioch and wrapped in linen, as an inestimable treasure left to the holy Church by the grace which was in the martyr."

The only conclusion which can be reached by an unpreju-

diced mind, after a full consideration of the Ignatian literature, is that it is a tissue of fraud and imposture. Even if there were an original element of fact, it is so small, and has been so completely overlaid by the grossest interpolations—which have manifestly been superimposed one upon another—that now it is impossible to discover it.

But whatever value we may attach to them, it is certain, that they afford no evidence of the existence of our synoptic gospels.

The following article upon the saintly subject of this sketch is from the pen of Prof. A. L. Rawson, D. D., and was written expressly for this work:

This blessed saint is said to have been one of the most eminent for learning, piety, devotion to the Church, and meek submission to trials and sufferings—which ended in a cruel death—of all of the immediate successors of the holy apostles. The day of his birth and his native country have been irrecoverably lost, but the events of his long life of service in the cause of Christianity have been preserved by divine Providence, assisted by the early Fathers of the Church. The pious historians of the early Church indulged in a contention over the question whether Ignatius was confirmed as bishop of Antioch by St. Peter or by St. John, having omitted to prove that he ever lived at all. This interesting matter was never really adjusted, and we are, therefore, left to conjecture as to the truth in the case; not a few having concluded, privately, that the whole story, so far as the two apostles, Peter and John, and the saint, Ignatius, are concerned, is a pious fabrication, invented for the purpose of filling up the early history of the Church.

The good bishop is said to have ministered in peace to his people for forty years, and with great honor to himself and glory to the cause of Christ, when the emperor Trajan began a persecution of the Church for the express purpose of supplying Christian men, women, and children as food for the wild beasts and amusement for the people of Rome in the

amphitheatre. The grandest proof of this statement is found in the fact that the ruins of the Coliseum are among the proudest remains of ancient Rome. There are not a few scholars and antiquarians who know that Trajan was one of the greatest and best emperors of Rome, who was commended by all for his moderation, sound judgment, and the simplicity of his personal habits. Pliny the Younger was his friend, and wrote a "Panegyric on Trajan" that bore no trace of religious bigotry or intolerance.

What a barefaced and impudent slander it has been, and is now, on the good name of the emperor Trajan that he tried the venerable bishop of Antioch in his native city, where he had lived and taught for forty years, and condemned him to be thrown alive to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Rome. It is an insult to our good sense and proper respect for the great and good men of the past, and a disgrace to our common humanity that such idle and scandalous tales are kept alive by the Church as a part of its sacred history.

The date of the entertainment in the Coliseum was not fixed by the ancient biographer of Ignatius, but was left for posterity to determine, somewhere between 107 and 115 A. D., for Trajan died in 117, in Cilicia, in the field with his army.

In the sacred service of the Church there have been many lives of St. Ignatius Theophorus written, three of which are held in great estimation by the faithful disciples of Christ. In these three we have rather discordant accounts of a journey from Antioch to Rome, chiefly by land, in A. D. 107, in which, among many other places, the venerable bishop visited Smyrna, calling on his brother bishop, Polycarp.

The guard of soldiers conducting the humble old man was strong but indulgent. They did not hurry him along so as to keep him wearied with travel, but rather journeyed with elegant leisure, since we are informed that Ignatius found time to write fifteen epistles, addressed to different churches along the route and in Rome.

It is true that some modern critical scholars have examined the two Greek versions of those epistles, the one long and the

other short in each epistle, and the Syriac version, which differs from both, and have concluded that it is more than probable that the whole story about St. Ignatius is fabulous.

The fabulous element appears in the narration of his experience with "ten leopards" and other wild beasts on the journey. The ten leopards are said to have been soldiers, who, in his estimation, deserved that character. And yet, few wild beasts would have enjoyed the infliction of fifteen theological essays on one journey. We may imagine a transformation of ten soldiers into the semblance of leopards after having heard fifteen consecutive dogmatic discourses. These soldiers must have been very lenient towards the condemned Christian, when they permitted him to write so many literary bombshells, advocating the same crimes for which he was then a prisoner and on his way to Rome to die; but, then, they were only men and pagans; Ignatius was a Christian bishop; was on his way to become a martyr, and expected to have his name inscribed in the "Catalogue of Saints."

The good and pious bishop showed his eminent devotion to the Church in traveling from Antioch in Syria, through Asia Minor to Smyrna, to Troas, and to Nicopolis in Macedonia, Philippi and other Greek cities westward, probably passing through Dodona, the seat of the ancient oracle, once so famous, without so much as mentioning such a thing as a work of Greek art, when that entire route was embellished by temples, palaces, triumphal arches, statues, and other works, the ruins of which are now the delight and admiration of the cultured world. The key to this conduct is found in one of his "epistles," where it is written, "Now I begin to be a disciple: I weigh neither visible nor invisible things, that I may win Christ."

His eminent example has been displayed by the Church for many centuries as a means of exciting imitation of his devotion among the disciples of Christ, and if it serves that purpose it does not concern the disciples to inquire whether it is true or not. The great truths are that the Church exists, that men and women are devoted to its service, and that the

pious examples of such lives are the fit subjects for such biographies as have been invented and named "Lives of the Saints."

Another truth is becoming apparent day by day, and this is the mischief the Church is working by holding on to dogmas that are outgrown and unfit for the present age. The Christian idea was adapted to the condition of society in the fifth and sixth centuries, but is not equally adapted to the present condition, which is advanced in knowledge and culture far beyond the society of twelve hundred years ago. It is also becoming rather a serious inquiry as to how far the Church is responsible for the ignorance, crime, and misery of the Dark Ages, when none but a favored few, outside of the clergy, could read, or had even the rudiments of education.

It is more than probable that the suggestion for the name and "life" of this saint was derived from a real Ignatius who was son of the emperor Michael Curopalates, and who was made patriarch at Constantinople A. D. 846. This Ignatius was a lion in the defense of the faith of the time, and summoned a council which condemned Photius and his party. Photius retaliated by excommunicating pope Nicholas of Rome, thus originating the great schism dividing the Greek and Latin churches.

The early Fathers of the Church, in casting about for names for the primitive heroes and martyrs of the faith, selected this one as already canonized by eminent services in the good cause. A lively fancy and pious devotion supplied the details, and mankind has been favored for several centuries with a great variety of biographies of the bishop, martyr, and saint, Ignatius of Antioch, Syria.

The Church history informs us that "only the harder portions of his holy remains were left, which were conveyed to Antioch and wrapped in linen, as an inestimable treasure left to the holy Church by the grace which was in the martyr."

The brethren who were eye-witnesses of the death of the holy martyr spent the whole night in tears, with bended knees and prayer, when, towards morning, they saw the blessed

Ignatius, some said standing and embracing them, others praying for them, and again others saw him "dropping with sweat, and standing by the Lord."

The epistles ascribed to Ignatius have occasioned more controversy than any other writings connected with the primitive Church, except only the gospels. Eight of them are condemned as forgeries by general consent among critics, who find in them internal evidence of their having been written in a late age, and at various times. Of the seven Greek epistles remaining in the list, there are a long and a short form of each, the short form being favored by critics as having fewer objectionable features. The most learned men in the Church, especially since Archbishop Usher, in 1644, have given the subject profound attention, but, as Dr. Lardner said (in 1743, in Credibility of the Gospel History), "I must own I have found it a very difficult question."

In 1845 Cureton published "The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius," and opened the controversy afresh. Three centuries of discussion over these letters have resulted in nothing definite being ascertained or determined concerning their authenticity, their age, or any other important point, except it may to strengthen the position of the critics who throw doubt and suspicion on the entire collection of epistles, together with their mythical author. The Syriac version simply shows that a community of Syriac monks considered the epistles of sufficient value and use to be worth translating. The antiquity of either the Greek, Latin, or Syriac version is not determinable beyond a comparatively recent date, reaching at the extreme to less than six centuries this side of the date of the supposed martyrdom of Ignatius.

The allusions to Ignatius in the writings of the other mythical personages of the early ages of the Church have no further weight than to show that the ingenuity of the inventors of those writings was in part equal to the task they had undertaken, but not fully so. They were, for instance, not able to conceal the important fact that the early persecutions

of the Church arose in the Church itself, and not among the pagan emperors or their tolerant subjects. The quarrels of the meek and lowly followers of the Lamb of God have always been bitter, and always will be, so long as men allow themselves to be domineered by the philosophy of what we do not and cannot know. The true Christian never quarrels with another. The peace that passeth all understanding is not warlike nor fault-finding nor mischief-making, except to denounce ignorance and prepare the way for enlightenment.

It is said in the account of the martyrdom of Ignatius that it was written by those who accompanied him on his voyage to Rome and were present at his death. Some critics have objected to this view because there is no reference to the narrative in the writings of the first six centuries of our era.

Those who accept it as genuine urge that it is in harmony with the texts of Eusebius and Chrysostom, and also that the narrative is characterized by its great simplicity. Among other interesting facts, Ignatius was identified with the child whom Jesus set before his disciples as a pattern of humility, as said in Matthew xviii, 2. From the fact that Jesus took him in his arms he was named Theophorus, which signifies "carried by God." Another of his biographers, who did not venture on adopting that legend, explains the name as meaning one who carries Christ as God in his breast. This is a sample of the childish stuff that is woven into these "sacred lives," and used by the Church for the instruction of its disciples. Surely there are yet people who, when bread is asked, will give a stone, and a serpent for a fish.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

DID he know anything of the gospels as we have them? This is the only question of importance attached to his name. He suffered martyrdom at Rome about A. D. 166–167 under Marcus Aurelius.

He wrote about the middle of the second century, for in his longer apology he speaks of perverted deductions being drawn from his teaching, "that Christ was born one hundred and fifty years ago under Cyrenius." Justin quotes in his writings from the memoirs of the apostles. We give several quotations showing his use of and reference to the memoirs:

"And the messenger then sent to that virgin, announced to her the glad news, saying, 'Behold, thou shalt conceive through the Holy Spirit, and bring forth a son, and he shall be called the son of the Most High, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; as those who have written memoirs concerning everything relating to our Savior Jesus Christ have taught, whom we believe."

In giving an account of the last supper Jesus ate with his disciples he says: "The apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called gospels, have thus informed us," etc.

Again he says: "On the day which is called the day of the sun (Sunday), we all, whether dwelling in cities or in the country, assemble together, when the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits." The battle of criticism has raged over these memoirs. Were they the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke? or were they other gospels now lost? We must bear in mind that Luke said there were many gospels written before he undertook to write his: "Forasmuch as many have taken in

hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us," etc. (Luke i, 1).

Concerning Matthew's gospel we also need to remember that Papias (A. D. 116), Irenæus (A. D. 178), Origen (A. D. 230), Epiphanius (A. D. 368), and Jerome (A. D. 342), all, without exception, expressly affirm that Matthew wrote his gospel in the Hebrew language. But the gospel now known as Matthew's is written in Greek; and not only have we no account of its having been translated, and no guarantee of such translation being a faithful one, but learned men are satisfied from internal evidence that it is not a translation at all, but must have been originally written in Greek. Our present gospel, therefore, cannot be the gospel to which the Fathers above cited refer. It is well known, if anything at all of that period can with accuracy be said to be well known by us, that the Ebionites and Nazarenes, two Christian sects, possessed a Hebrew gospel, which they considered to be the only genuine one, and which they called the Gospel according to Matthew. And it appears pretty certain that if the Ebionite or Nazarene gospel was not the original Hebrew of Matthew, no such original Hebrew gospel existed.

At a comparatively early period a vast number of spurious writings bearing the names of apostles and their followers, and claiming more or less direct apostolic authority, were in circulation in the early Church; gospels according to Peter, to Thomas, to James, to Judas, according to the Twelve, to Barnabas, to Matthias, to Nicodemus, etc.; and ecclesiastical writers bear abundant testimony to the early and rapid growth of apocryphal literature. The very names of most of such apocryphal gospels are lost, whilst of others we possess considerable information; but nothing is more certain than the fact that there existed many works bearing names which render the attempt to interpret the title of Justin's gospel as a description of the four in our common version a mere absurdity.

We cannot go into an extended discussion of Justin's memoirs, as it is not within the scope of this work to venture upon criticism at large; yet we may offer some considerations

why we think he does not quote from our Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, not to say anything of John's, which evidently was of later origin than the synoptics.

"For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called gospels." The last phrase is regarded by good critics to be an interpolation. For if Justin really stated that the memoirs were called "gospels," it seems incomprehensible that he should never call them so himself. And in no other place does he apply the plural to them, but on all occasions speaks of the "gospel." And in this he does not intimate that the records were inspired, but memoirs, or recollections of the apostles. According to Justin, the Old Testament contained all that was necessary to salvation, and its prophecies were the sole criterion of truth, the memoirs, and even Jesus himself being only its interpreter. Justin, in his last work against Marcion, said, "I would not have believed the Lord himself, if he had proclaimed any other God than the Creator,"—a passage quoted with approval by Irenæus—that is to say, the God of the Old Testament.

Justin never mentions the name of Matthew, Mark, or Luke, although he makes many quotations from the memoirs, and this suggests to us that in all probability he did not know any gospels by those names, but that he was acquainted with one known as "Memoirs of the Apostles."

1. Justin's quotations, almost without exception, vary more or less from the parallels in the canonical text.

2. Justin quotes expressions of Jesus which are not found in our gospels at all.

3. And he makes quotations which are foreign to the canonical gospels, and contradictory of gospel statements.

Justin makes use of the phrase, "Magi from Arabia," nine times, which leads us irresistibly to the conviction that the memoirs contain it; a phrase foreign to our gospels.

Justin says, that, "Christ, being regarded as a carpenter (or worker in wood), did make, while among men, ploughs and yokes; thus setting before them symbols of righteousness, and

teaching an active life." He derives this from some other source than the canonical gospels.

In relating the baptism of Jesus, Justin says, "When Jesus came to the river Jordan, where John was baptizing, upon entering the water, a fire was kindled in the Jordan; and the apostles of this same person, our Messiah, have written that when he came out of the water, the Holy Spirit, like a dove, alighted upon him." It is obvious that he received this from some other source than our gospels.

The following is a direct quotation of Justin, from the memoirs. Accordingly, our Lord Jesus Christ said, "In whatever actions I apprehend you, by those I will judge you."

Again he says: "For they who saw him crucified also wagged their heads each one of them, and distorted their lips, and screwing their noses, one to another spoke ironically those words which are written in the memoirs of his apostles: 'He declared himself the son of God; come down, let him walk about, let God save him.'"

These passages can nowhere be found in the canonical gospels; and it is manifest that Justin's memoirs furnished him with both facts and methods of expression at once foreign and contradictory to our gospels.

It is claimed that Justin quoted from memory, and that this will explain the lack of verbal agreement between his quotations from the memoirs and the parallel passages in the synoptics. But it must be remembered that he almost always quotes the memoirs in language differing from the gospels, while his quotations from the Septuagint are almost uniformly accurate. Now, such a phenomenon is elsewhere unparalleled in those times, when memory was more cultivated than with us in these days of cheap printed books, and it is unreasonable to charge Justin with such universal want of memory and carelessness about matters which he held so sacred, merely to support a foregone conclusion, when the recognition of a different source, indicated in every direction, is so much more simple, natural, and justifiable.

POLYCARP.

IRENÆUS says that Polycarp in his youth was a disciple of the apostle John; and even if this were not doubtful, the thing which chiefly interests us is whether or not the epistle of Polycarp gives any evidence of the existence of the canonical gospels.

Irenæus states that Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna, and was deputed to Rome one hundred and sixty years after Christ as a representative of the churches of Asia, for the discussion respecting the day on which the Christian Passover should be celebrated, and ended his life by martyrdom one hundred and sixty-seven years after Christ.

The epistle of Polycarp refers to the martyr-journey of Ignatius; but, as we have already seen that these several martyrologies of Ignatius are spurious, or utterly corrupted by interpolations, we are forced to conclude that the epistle of Polycarp, also, is fabulous.

And this is the opinion of many critics who have examined all the evidences thoroughly. There were doubts of its authenticity at a very early date. The anachronisms of the epistle itself reveal its inherent weakness and worthlessness as evidence. The epistle speaks of the "blessed Ignatius" as already a long time dead, and he is held up with Zozimus and Rufus, and also with Paul and the rest of the apostles, as examples of patience, men who have not run in vain, but are with the Lord; but in one of the succeeding chapters of this epistle he is spoken of as living, and information is requested regarding him, "and those who are with him." Moreover, although thus spoken of as alive, the writer already knows of his epistles, and refers in the plural to those written by him "to us and all the rest which we have by us."

The writer vehemently denounces as already widely spread the Gnostic heresy, which did not exist until the time of Marcion, to whom he refers in unmistakable terms. He characterizes these heretics as the "first born of Satan," and Irenæus reports that when Polycarp was in Rome he applied to Marcion in person the epithet "first born of Satan." The development of these heresies, therefore, implies a date for the composition of the epistle, at earliest, after the middle of the second century.

The epistle does not mention our gospels, nor is its language and precepts such as would lead one to the belief that the writer was acquainted with them.

We will here insert what our learned friend, Prof. A. L. Rawson, has to say upon the subject of this sketch.

Polycarp.—Bishop, Martyr, Saint.

The contemplation of the life of the eminent bishop, the holy martyr and blessed saint, Polycarp, fills our soul with profound emotions of veneration, sympathy, and adoration. The number of the early Fathers and martyrs is too small to spare any one out of the precious line; every one being needed to complete the glorious procession, beginning with the preaching of the gospel by the seventy disciples sent out into all the world before the horrible darkness of the day of crucifixion. From that day to this, through the timely and prayerful labors of the early Fathers of the Church, the succession of dignitaries, popes, bishops, martyrs, and saints has been unbroken, and by divine favor the noble army of martyrs and the glorious host of saints have steadily increased. It is to be deplored that in these degenerate days bishops are like other men, martyrs are few and not very willing, and saints are open to the suspicions that cling to human nature generally. Alas, we lament the good old times of the long ago, when, from the absence of the printing press, newspapers, and telegraph, mir-

acles and martyrs and saints were much more numerous than at present.

We resume our biography of the revered bishop of Smyrna, Polycarp. The date of his birth is left in sad obscurity. Some sinful writers deny that he ever was born outside of the prolific brain of the early Fathers of the Church, who supplied his original biography. The life was more important than his birth, and his death greater than all his life, for by it he bore witness to his readiness to die for the honor and glory of the good and tender heavenly Father who regards even a falling sparrow. It is so sweet to die in the cause of the Church when it can be done by proxy afar off in the early ages of the Christian faith, when multitudes made it a pleasant and remunerative occupation to revile the rulers and gain through martyrdom the crown of eternal fame in the catalogue of the faithful. (Catalogues of the martyrs and saints are somewhat rare and high priced, but may be found in some of the great libraries.)

We know that he was bishop of the church at Smyrna, because that church is mentioned by name in the book of the Revelations of St. John the divine, in the second chapter at the eighth verse, and no other name is given besides his in that age as officer of the Church.

The incidents of his holy life have been purposely left in oblivion. Good works are of no value in the race for honors in the Church; the only priceless treasures are faith and a pious death. Both these valuable articles the sainted man had, as appears in the simple and truthful account of his martyrdom.

The Roman proconsul, forgetting the law of toleration that ruled the Romans everywhere, demanded of the good old man a renunciation of his faith in Christ. After having said his prayers to Christ for eighty-six years, the habit had grown too strong to be broken off suddenly, and Polycarp declined, with pointed remarks. The proconsul, whose name was Herod, was probably a descendant of the very Herod whose fame had been established in the Church by his posthumous

massacre of infants at Bethlehem, and he was true to the instincts of his race. All the consuls and proconsuls and other rulers of that early age of the Church thirsted day and night for the blood of martyred man and women, and especially of beautiful and high-born maidens. We are not informed that they were cannibals, and yet we are left to adopt that revolting conclusion, for it is said that the body of Polycarp was not to be found after the fire had been quenched that had in vain been lighted to reduce him to cinders. Notice the "sacred story," and draw your own conclusion.

The horrid incidents of his untimely death at the martyr's stake are carefully set down by the clerical reporters who were doubtless eye-witnesses of the terrible scene. They heard the cruel dialogue between the steel-clad Roman warrior proconsul and the withered and feeble old man of eighty-six years, and saw the pitchy fagots piled high around the revered form, and shivered when the torch lighted up the devouring flame. Polycarp was not alone in his blissful passage to Elysium, for some say there were eleven, others say twelve other victims of the insatiable pagan rulers, who were supplied by the devoted disciples of the Church in Philadelphia, which is also alluded to by name in the book of Revelations.

They also saw with dreadful awe a soldier pierce the sacred side of the holy Polycarp with a lance, and, oh, delightful and soul-inspiring sight! they witnessed the appearance of a dove that flew out of the hideous rent in his bleeding side, and the dove sweetly cooed as it winged its flight towards heaven, from whence a moment before had been heard a voice exhorting the faithful disciple to behave like a man. The dove was the tender and pious and faithful soul of the now sainted martyr, Polycarp. From out of the same wound there came a torrent of water that extinguished the flames in an instant, far exceeding the proudest results of the patent Babcock Fire Extinguisher. Then the body, which the reporters say was browned like a well-baked loaf of bread, disappeared and was nowhere to be found. After some time, another writer says,

the surviving friends having raised quite a clamor, the bones were given to them, and they deposited them in a shrine in the church. The bones are there now, picked clean of every vestige of meat, and we have every reason to believe—but we forbear to say what, for humanity's sake.

The devoted disciples of Polycarp were suspected by their enemies of an intention to join in a holy communion with the roasted remains of their beloved pastor, and so, rejecting the crucified Jesus, worship the cremated Polycarp. But Herod was firm, his appetite good, and that heresy was nipped in the bud.

An early father tells us that the kind-hearted bishop suspecting trouble from the Romans, and not being willing to deprive his people of their spiritual guide, retired to the house of a friend in the suburbs for a few days. He was betrayed by a tell-tale servant girl, and the soldiers coming to arrest him, he was allowed to engage in prayer, and he continued his invocation for two hours, after which he was endowed with firmer courage and stronger faith, which enabled him to pass through his trials unscathed, and win his fadeless crown of martyrdom.

We owe a heavy debt of gratitude to the early Fathers who have lent their aid in preserving this truthful history from loss, addition, or change, and we here record their names with profound respect: The original story is credited to Irenæus, who was a disciple of the learned Polycarp, bishop of Lyons in France, and was recruited into the noble army of martyrs by the emperor, Septimius Severus, or some other emperor, A. D. 202, or 208, as different accounts aver. His account was copied by Caius (who *he* was we are not informed), and again it was transcribed by a certain Socrates of Corinth, from whose text Pionius wrote, after "having carefully searched into them, and the blessed Polycarp having manifested them" to him "through revelation."

We must not be surprised at the omission by the Roman and Greek writers of all accounts of these early bishops, martyrs, and saints. They had their own affairs to look after,

and were paid to write up the notables of their own religion. They believed that to say nothing about the new religion would kill it the soonest. So they practiced silence towards the Christian Church for at least three hundred years.

There is one source of regret in this otherwise spotless biography, and that is the apparent necessity of heaping vile slanders and opprobriums on the Roman emperor and his consuls, in charging them with inquisitorial conduct, intolerance, bigotry, hate, murders, and general bloodthirstiness against Christians, when we learn from the most authentic history that they were almost without exception men of good character, who were respected and loved by their people. In the case of Aurelius, he is said to have been a stoic philosopher, refined and cultured, and tolerant of all religions, so much so that he was himself initiated into the mysteries of Eleusis at Athens. Aurelius was the author of a work called "Meditations," which is yet valued by all who have read it—and very few among thinking men have not—as an excellent work on moral discipline. No writer, whether Christian or profane, has as yet reconciled the slanders against Aurelius with his general good character for probity and enlightenment. But in the sacred cause of the Church all other interests dwindle into insignificance, and the early Father who does not defame an emperor, slander a consul, and sacrifice truth in the interest of the Church deserves to be dropped from the list of canonized saints, for of such is the brilliant array of Church historians of the early ages, who braved every danger in falsifying truth, inventing calumny, and forging history. Let us venerate the sacred name Polycarp as a symbol of this peculiar devotion to the Church.

PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS.

Papias was bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in the first half of the second century, and is said to have suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius about one hundred and sixty-four to one hundred and sixty-seven years after Christ; and the all-important question connected with his writings is, Do they show that he was acquainted with our gospels? About the middle of the second century he wrote a work, in five books, entitled "Exposition of the Lord's Oracles," which, with the exception of a few fragments, preserved to us chiefly by Eusebius and Irenæus, is, unfortunately, no longer extant. This work was less based on written records of the teachings of Jesus than on those which Papias had been able to collect from tradition, which he considered more authentic, for, like his contemporary, Hegesippus, Papias avowedly preferred tradition to any written works with which he was acquainted. In the preface to his book he himself stated: "I shall not hesitate to set beside my interpretations all that I rightly learned from the Presbyters, and rightly remembered, earnestly testifying to its truth. For I have not, like the multitude, delighted in those who spoke much, but in those who taught the truth, nor in those who recorded alien commandments, but in those who recall those delivered by the Lord to faith, and which come from truth itself. If it happened that any one came who followed the Presbyters, I inquired minutely after the words of the Presbyters, what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew said, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord said, and what Aristion and the Presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say, for I held that what

was to be derived from books was not so profitable as that from the living and abiding voice (of tradition)." It is clear from this that even if Papias knew any of our gospels he attached little or no value to them.

His work was evidently intended to furnish a more complete collection of the discourses of Jesus from oral tradition than any previously existing, with his own expositions.

There has been a great deal of controversy as to whether the Presbyter John is identical with the Apostle John, for Irenæus asserts that Papias was "the hearer of John [meaning the apostle] and companion of Polycarp." Eusebius has plainly pointed out that such could not have been the case. Besides, we may add, that a writer who suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius (A. D. 165) could scarcely have been a hearer of the apostles. The account which the Presbyter John is said to have given of Mark's gospel is as follows: "And the Presbyter also said: Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately what he remembered, though he did not arrange in order the things which were either said or done by Christ. For he was neither a hearer of the Lord nor followed him; but afterwards, as I said, accompanied Peter, who adapted his teachings to the occasion, and not as making a consecutive record of the discourses of the Lord. Mark, therefore, did not do wrong in thus writing down some things as he remembered them. For of one point he was careful—to omit none of the things which he heard, and to narrate none of them falsely. These facts Papias relates concerning Mark." The question to decide is, whether or not the work here described is our canonical gospel.

The first point in this account is the statement that Mark was an interpreter of Peter. Was he merely secretary of the apostle, writing in a manner from his dictation, or does the passage mean that he translated the Aramaic narrative of Peter into Greek? Irenæus says, "After their decease [Peter and Paul], Mark, the interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing that which had been preached by Peter." Eusebius quotes Clement of Alexandria as saying: "The cause for

which the gospel—according to Mark—was written, was this: When Peter had publicly preached the Word at Rome, and proclaimed the gospel by the spirit, many who were present requested Mark, as he had followed him from afar and remembered what he had said, to write down what he had spoken; and when he had composed the gospel he gave it to those who had required it of him; which, when Peter knew, he neither hindered nor encouraged it." Tertullian repeats the same tradition. He says: "And the gospel which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peters', whose interpreter Mark was . . . for it may rightly appear that works which disciples publish are of their masters." Origen states that "the second [gospel] is, according to Mark, written as Peter directed him." Eusebius gives a longer and more embellished version than any of those who had written before him. He says: "So much, however, did the effulgence of piety illuminate the minds of those [Romans] who heard Peter, that it did not content them to hear him once, nor to receive only the unwritten doctrine of the divine teaching, but they in every way entreated Mark, whose gospel we have, as the companion of Peter, that he should leave them a written record of the doctrine thus orally conveyed. Nor did they cease their entreaties until they had persuaded the man, and thus became the cause of writing of the gospel called according to Mark. They say, moreover, that the apostle [Peter] having become aware—through revelation to him of the spirit—of what had been done, was delighted with the ardor of the men, and ratified the work in order that it might be read in the churches. This narrative is given by Clement in the sixth book of his 'Institutions,' whose testimony is supported by that of Papias, the bishop of Hierapolis."

Jerome gives a similar version. He relates that "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, being entreated by the brethren of Rome, wrote a short gospel according to what he had heard from Peter, which when Peter heard he approved, and gave his authority for its being read in the Church, as Clement writes in the sixth book of his 'institutions.'" Jerome

moreover says that Peter had Mark for an interpreter, "whose gospel is composed; Peter narrating and he writing." In the quotations we have a mass of contradictions. Irenæus dates the writing of Mark after the death of Peter and Paul in Rome.

Clement describes Mark as writing during Peter's life, and says that that apostle was indifferent to its publication, but according to Eusebius, was aware of the undertaking of Mark and was delighted with the work, and lent it the weight of his authority.

But it is manifest that all these writers merely repeat with variations the traditions regarding the first two gospels which Papias originated.

We recur again to his statement that, "Mark having become an interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately what he remembered."

It is plain that if Mark accompanied Peter and wrote down "accurately what he remembered," he must have remembered the prominent personal adventures of Peter. But as we read the second gospel we find no traces of Petrine influence in it. It is the work of a biographer to give prominence to his hero; but in this case Mark omits many things which he must have known and might have mentioned to the praise of Peter, but he did not, and we therefore conclude that the second gospel was not the preaching of Peter interpreted by Mark. In the third gospel the narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes is related, but in this most memorable event, according to the second gospel, Peter had no part.

In Matthew, Jesus goes into the house of Peter, to cure his wife's mother, whilst in Mark it is into the house of Simon and Andrew. The important episode of Peter's walking on the sea, as related in Matthew, is altogether ignored by Mark.

The emphatic declaration of Jesus: "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church," and so forth, is wholly unknown to Mark. The miracle of finding the tribute money in the fish's mouth is narrated in the first but omitted in the second gospel.

There are many more passages in Matthew which give prominence to Peter, that are wanting in Mark; and these omissions render it evident that the writer of the second gospel was not a companion of Peter, who "wrote accurately" and was careful to omit none of the things which he had heard, and not to narrate any of them falsely.

The work of Mark which Papias describes, evidently is not identical with our second gospel: "Mark having become an interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately what he remembered, though he did not arrange in order the things which were either said or done by Christ. "For he was neither a hearer of the Lord, nor followed him, but afterwards as I said, accompanied Peter, who adapted his teaching to the occasion, and not as making a consecutive record of the discourses of the Lord."

This discretion would lead us to expect a fragmentary work, composed of reminiscences of the teaching of Peter, without reference to order or connection. But this description does not describe our second gospel. It opens formally, and after a consecutive narrative of his teachings and works, the history ends with a full and consecutive account of the last events in the life of Jesus, his trial, crucifixion, and resurrection.

The whole gospel is an orderly arrangement, and cannot be the work which Papias has described from the authority of presbyter John. It must be noted, moreover, that Papias does not call the work ascribed to Mark a gospel, but merely the preaching of Peter.

It is not necessary for us to account for the manner in which the work to which presbyter John referred disappeared, and the present Gospel according to Mark became substituted for it. The merely negative evidence that our gospel is not described by Papias is sufficient for our purpose. Any one acquainted with the thoroughly uncritical character of the Fathers, and with the literary history of the early Christian Church, will readily conceive the facility with which this has been accomplished. The great mass of intel-

ligent critics are agreed that our synoptic gospels have assumed their present form only after repeated modifications by various editors of earlier evangelical works. These changes have not been effected without traces being left by which the various materials may be separated and distinguished, but the more primitive gospels have entirely disappeared, supplanted by the later and ampler versions.

Canon Westcott himself admits that "the proof of the canon is rendered more difficult by the uncritical character of the first two centuries." He says: "The spirit of the ancient world was essentially uncritical." In other words, in the earlier ages of the Church the minds of men were singularly credulous and superstitious. All sorts of absurdities and marvelous events are recorded in their writings. No fable could be too gross, no invention too transparent, for their unsuspicious acceptance if it assumed a pious form or tended to edification.

Papias says that Matthew wrote a work: "Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, and every one interpreted them as he was able." He does not, however, call the Matthew who wrote the oracles an apostle. The Gospel of Matthew is something more than the discourses of Jesus, and it, therefore, looks as though Papias was describing some other early writings. He says that the work of Matthew was written in Hebrew or Aramaic dialect.

It is impossible upon any but arbitrary grounds, and from a foregone conclusion, to maintain that a work commencing with a detailed history of the birth and infancy of Jesus, his genealogy, and the preaching of John the Baptist, and concluding with an equally minute history of the betrayal, trial, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus, and having for its evident aim throughout the demonstration that the Messianic prophecy was fulfilled in him, and which relates all the miracles, can be called "the oracles or discourses of the Lord."

Our Gospel of Matthew is Greek; and even Tischendorf is obliged to admit that it was originally written in Greek and is not a translation. If, therefore, we have any evidence from

Papias that Matthew wrote a work in Hebrew, it evidently is now lost, and the Greek Gospel of Matthew not being a translation of it, there is no evidence whatever that Matthew wrote anything. Manifestly, there was no translation of the work which Matthew wrote in Hebrew, for Papias says, "Each one translated it as he was able."

Papias gives no evidence of the existence of our gospels at the time he wrote, about the middle of the second century.

IRENÆUS.

ALL THAT we really know about the personal history of Irenæus may be summed up in a few sentences, though what we gather of his spirit and policy from his writings deserves a more extended mention.

He was born in Greece, about the year 140, and was a disciple of both Papias and Polycarp, by the latter of whom he is said to have been sent to Gaul. He was at first a priest in the church of Lyons, and on the death of Pothinus, in 177, succeeded him in the bishopric. He had a disputation with Valentinius at Rome, and held a council at Lyons, in which the Gnostic heresy was condemned. His great literary work, also, is a refutation of the Valentinian form of Gnosticism, and is usually named "Adversus Hœresus. The original Greek, with the exception of a portion preserved by succeeding writers, has been lost, and the remaining portion of the work is in a poor Latin version.

Irenæus has the repute of having been a great lover of peace and expediency, even at the expense of justice; and he labored hard to allay the controversy which, even in those good old primitive Christian times, raged with such violence, and all about the true time of celebrating Easter.

The common idea that he suffered martyrdom rests on no foundation whatever; and even if he did, what would it prove in his favor, as against his cringing and laudatory servility to the even then comparatively powerful Church of Rome?

It is high time that this ancient and saintly priest should be exhibited in his true colors; and we shall proceed to do it from an authority which ranks among the highest in the esti-

mation of thorough students—clerie and lay—of ecclesiastical history.

Irenæus, then, in arguing with the Gnostics, takes care to show that in the Roman Church the series of bishops had been continued down without interruption from the time of the apostles, and that their regular succession had never been disturbed or sullied by the intervention of any stranger or person whose principles were in any respect different from those of the apostles. Without even so much as mentioning the other churches, he contents himself with opposing to the Gnostics the sentiments of the church at Rome alone. He, with Tertullian, passes over, without the slightest notice, that church which it would be most natural to regard as the head and mother of all churches—the church at Jerusalem. Indeed, he may be considered as tacitly treating it with contempt when he gives to the church at Rome the preference over all the others, extols it on many accounts, and attributes to it a vast superiority or preëminence.

And why should Irenæus pay this supreme homage to the church at Rome? Mosheim says the reason may be assigned without much difficulty: "Irenæus had been at Rome, and he was, without doubt, indebted for many kindnesses to the Roman bishop, Elentherus; added to which, he was the bishop of a poor little church which had suffered considerably in the recent persecutions under Marcus, and stood very much in need of the comfort and assistance that were to be afforded by the great and opulent church at Rome and its bishop. To speak in plain terms, he was no stranger to the advantages that were to be derived from the wealth and beneficence of the church at Rome, and he therefore made no scruple of flattering her pretensions to a point on the accomplishment of which he knew that she was bent, namely, that of exalting herself to a superiority over the other Christian churches."

It is true that his "Five Books against Heresies" (with the exception of the first) have reached us merely through the medium of a somewhat obscure, and to say the least, very

unclassical Latin translation, still there can be no doubt of the gist of those original words of which that translation has thus rendered: "*Ad hanc enim ecclesiam* [*Romanam*], *propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea, quæ est ab apostolis traditio.*" If those words mean anything, they must mean at least that it behooved all Christians in matters of doubt connected with religion, to resort for advice and direction to the church at Rome, on account, first, of its more powerful sovereignty, and, secondly, of its being *par excellence*, the conservator of apostolic tradition. In another place he writes of this church as the greatest and the most ancient, recognized by all, founded and instituted by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul.

While the "words of a private individual, the bishop of merely a poor little insignificant church," and one "whose mental qualifications and endowments were certainly nothing more than of a middling order," as Mosheim puts it, ought certainly not to be quoted by Romanists as meaning that the church at Rome was to be consulted by all the other churches, and made the universal arbitress in all ages to come: while to do this is even especially dishonest and unbecoming in men of learning and talents: still there can be no doubt that these and other declarations of Irenæus taken in conjunction with what we know of his personal relations to the wealthy bishop and church of the great city, had that very effect, in a very marked degree, by indoctrinating and preparing the minds of subsequent writers, dignitaries, and particularly Roman bishops to claim for the Roman church more and more of preëminence, dignity, and authority, until at last the whole thing finally culminated in the Roman pontificate and the imperial system of Roman Catholicism.

For Popery, then, and the innumerable curses which it has brought in its train, we have in a great measure to thank this much-vaunted holy Father of the primitive Church, Irenæus. That is what his name principally stands for in history,

though we may here incidentally say that he was also a zealous collector of traditions, which he gathered from all quarters with a childlike eagerness and credulity; that he was accustomed to boast of his silly ability to enumerate all the bishops that had ever been appointed by the apostles and their successors, down to his own time; that he had strong faith that the second coming of Christ was nigh at hand, and drew luxurious pictures of the felicity of his kingdom on earth, in the immediate future; that he firmly believed in all kinds of impossible fulfillments of prophecies, in the wildest miracles, and especially in the reality of demoniacal possessions, and the power of the Christians of his day to cast out devils, even appealing to his pagan enemies in proof of it; that his writings contain the earliest embodiment of the silly declaration that Jesus was God, and to be worshiped, a dogma of which the church at Rome, which controlled that of Lyons, became, as early as the second century, the main defender and propagandist; and that, finally, he was the very first Christian writer who made any allusion whatever to the four gospels of the New Testament canon. On this latter point we feel it our duty to dilate a little. This allusion was made in the year 182, that is, nearly one hundred and fifty years after the time of Christ, according to Dr. Lardner. Tillont and Massuet, however, two great French Christian writers, even think the more probable date of this publication was 192, ten years later.

It is admitted on all hands that these gospels were not named by any of the pre-Irenæan fathers, to wit: Barnabas, Clemens, Romanus, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Justin Martyr, Tatian, and Hegesippus. And upon what authority did Irenæus present these four gospels as genuine? It was on his own authority alone. Now, the celebrated Dr. Whitby in alluding to the conduct of this Father and Papias complains bitterly of their having "handed down the actions of the apostles and their disciples from paltry rumors, and dubious reports"; and as "having scandalously deluded the world with fables and lying narrations." It has been very pertinently

asked, "If such were the general practices of Irenæus, what authority have we that these four gospels, said by him to be written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, are not like the rest of his productions, mere 'fables and lying narratives?'" To which it has been quite as pertinently replied: "We have every occasion to believe, indeed, that such is the fact, especially when we remember the extraordinary reasons he assigns for their being four, and just four gospels inspired. His reasons are, 'because there are but four quarters of the world, and every cherubim has four faces.' Strange animals those cherubims, unquestionably; but what a reason? How worthy of a priest! Every cherubim has four faces, *ergo*, there are only four inspired gospels. What logic! How convincing! How unanswerable! How worthy of the book they are written to support!"

But what of the many other gospels which were notoriously in circulation and held in high esteem by most of the early Christians at the time when Irenæus introduced the four gospels to the world? How could he determine that these four alone were genuine, and the rest spurious? "Did the 'cherubims with four faces' enlighten him upon the subject? Be that as it may, such an important question could not be determined except by one of enlarged intellect, erudition, and perspicacity. And was Irenæus such a man? Confessedly not. On the contrary, he was weak and credulous, and, as Dr. Whitby says, in the habit of writing 'fables and lying narratives.' It is evident, therefore, that the authority of Irenæus upon this vital point is worth just as much as his logic."

This is not the time or place to enter with great show of detail into an account of the many other gospels, at least upwards of fifty, which were in circulation at the time Irenæus first mentioned these four gospels, and which had, we are told, existed for nearly a century before, and were considered genuine by the early Christians, and actually read and quoted as the word of God. We shall simply ask whether those who lived at the time those books are said to have appeared were not more likely to know which gospels, epistles, acts, and

revelations were false and which were true tnan those who flourished centuries subsequently? From the era of Christ until the latter end of the fourth century there was no authorized collection of the writings of the New Testament. As to this matter, all was doubt and dispute for the first three hundred years, during the very time everything should have been certain and satisfactory. If it was all doubt about fifteen hundred years ago, can it be all certainty now? Indeed, in these crucial modern times, the great critic, Dr. Whiston, has declared that no less than twenty-seven of these books are genuine. "Can any one," says he, "be so weak as to imagine Mark and Luke and James and Jude, who were none of them more than companions of the apostles, to be our sacred and unerring guides, and Barnabas, Thaddeus, Clement, Timothy, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, who were equally companions of the same apostles, to be of no authority at all?" And the Rev. J. Martineau, in his "Rationale of Religions Inquiry," observes, "If we could recover the gospels of the Hebrews, and that of the Egyptians, it would be difficult to give a reason why they should not form a part of the New Testament; and an epistle actually exists, by Clement, the fellow-laborer of Paul, which has as good a claim to stand there as the Epistle to the Hebrews or the Gospel of Luke. If none but the works of the twelve apostles were admitted, the rule would be clear and simple; but what are Mark and Luke, who are received, more than Clement and Barnabas, who are excluded?" Moreover, Archbishop Wake actually translated from the Greek the "Apostolic Fathers" of the first century, viz: Barnabas, Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Hermas, and strongly recommended them to the Christian world as inspired, and "containing an authoritative declaration of the gospel of Christ to us." And furthermore, the learned Bishop Marsh positively avers that "it is an undoubted fact that those Christians by whom the now-rejected gospels were received, and who are now called heretics, were in the right in many points of criticism, where the Fathers accused them of willful corruption."

After this short digression, we return to the subject of our sketch, about whom we have nothing further to say than that he died at Lyons about the year 202, and that, as we have already intimated, the story of his martyrdom is utterly groundless, and doubtless only one of the thousands of pious frauds with which an unscrupulous priesthood has in all ages and countries gulled superstitious ignorance.

TERTULLIAN.

THIS renowned Latin Father of the Church was the son of a centurion in the service of the proconsul of Africa, and was born at Carthage about the year 160. While yet unconverted he became an eminent rhetorician. It is said that witnessing the constancy of the martyrs converted him to Christianity, either at Carthage or Rome; and he soon obtained the office of presbyter. While at Rome, during the persecution under Severus, he drew up (about 198) his famous "Apology" for the Christians, addressed to the Roman magistracy.

During the latter part of his life he embraced the doctrines of the heretic Montanus. To these his ardent, sensuous imagination and ascetic tendencies naturally inclined him, even if he had not determined to take that course by the lack of appreciation and jealous treatment which he received from the Roman clergy. Whether he remained a Montanist till his death, or ultimately returned to the bosom of the then orthodox and Catholic Church, cannot be decided.

Tertullian lived to a great age, and ultimately wrote a very large number of works, some of which were early lost. "They are of four classes; apologetical, practical, doctrinal, and polemical. They are characterized by great learning, . . . fiery imagination, and passionate partisanship, leading into exaggeration and sophistry." His style is frequently obscure. St. Jerome thus speaks of them: "Who more learned, more acute than Tertullian, whose 'Apology,' and books against the heathen embrace all the learning of the age?"

The most important of his extant works are the "Apology

against the Gentiles for the Christians," "To the Martyrs," "Concerning the Testimony of the Soul" (in which he laboriously endeavors to work out the absurd theologico-metaphysical idea of the 'preconformity of the human soul to the doctrine of Christ'), "Concerning the Treatment of Heretics," "Concerning Repentance," "Concerning Patience," and "Concerning Baptism."

A conscientious study of these works at the present day reveals the unwelcome facts that the author was morbidly addicted to childishly ingenious pedantry, puzzle, and paradox; that his style is not only tumid and bombastic, but beyond all measure studiously obscure; that his opinions are harsh, oftentimes uncertain, and foreign to reason; "in fine," as Mosheim remarks, "they plainly indicate him to have been a man of a credulous turn of mind, much addicted to severity, and possessed of more subtlety than solid learning. . . . For, not to notice the obsolete and unusual terms which he, on some occasions, seems studiously to go out of the way for, and equally passing over a variety of phrases connected with jurisprudence, and of which it is scarcely to be hoped that any one should give us any satisfactory explanation at the present day, his thoughts are, in innumerable instances, expressed in a way . . . so obscure and so ambiguous that we are left in a state of utter uncertainty as to what it is that he means."

In his religious controversies Tertullian bristles with misstatements and false conclusions, and is turbid with abuse. He was a master of violent and unscrupulous vituperation. His statements regarding the gospel of Marcion, whom he calls "impious and sacrilegious," that excellent critic, Eichorn, pronounces utterly untrustworthy, asserting, from the strongest evidence, that he had not that work itself before him at all.

The author of that most thorough and scholarly work, "Supernatural Religion," declares that Tertullian's "trustworthiness is very far from being above suspicion," and speaks of him as one "whose inaccuracy is often apparent."

And Reuss says that "his Christianism is ardent, sincere, and deeply anchored in his soul. You can see that he lives on it. But this Christianism of his is acrid, insolent, brutal, and quarrelsome. He is devoid of unction, without charity, often even without candor, from the moment he finds himself face to face with any kind of opposition. He is a soldier who only knows how to fight, and forgets even while fighting that he should respect his enemy. A subtle and sly dialectician, he excels in ridiculing his adversaries. Abuse, sarcasm, language which even at times reminds one of Rabelais, an effrontery of affirmation in his moments of weakness which touches on, and often reaches to bad faith—such are his arms. . . . If, during the second century, all, except a few Gnostics, were intolerant, Tertullian was certainly the most intolerant of all."

Tertullian was not only an unscrupulous deceiver, he was also most easily deceived—full of superstition to the very core of his being, as is usual with lying impostors and charlatans in all times and countries. As an instance of his spiritualistic credulity, we shall notice, in the first place, the gist of what he says about demons. According to his imagination, "demons are the offspring of the fallen angels, and their work is the destruction of the human race. They inflict diseases and other painful calamities upon our bodies, and lead astray our souls. From their wonderful subtleness and tenuity they find their way into both parts of our composition. Their spirituality enables them to do much harm to men, for, being invisible and impalpable, they appear rather in their effects than their action. They blight the apples and the grain while in the flower, as by some mysterious poison in the breeze, and kill them in the bud, or nip them before they are ripe, as though in some inexpressible way the tainted air poured forth its pestilential breath. In the same way demons and angels breathe into the soul and excite its corruptions, and especially mislead men by inducing them to sacrifice to false deities in order that they may thus obtain their peculiar food of fumes of flesh and blood. Every

spirit, whether angel or demon, has wings; therefore they are everywhere in a moment. The whole world is but one place to them, and all that takes place anywhere they can know and report with equal facility. Their swiftness is believed to be divine, because their substance is unknown, and thus they seek to be considered the authors of effects which they merely report, as, indeed, they sometimes are of the evil, but never of the good. They gather intimations of the future from hearing the prophets read aloud, and set themselves up as rivals of the true God by stealing his divinations. From inhabiting the air, and from their proximity to the stars and commerce with the clouds, they know the preparation of celestial phenomena, and promise beforehand the rains which they feel coming. They are very kind in reference to the cure of diseases, Tertullian ironically says, for they first make people ill, and then, by way of performing a miracle, they prescribe remedies either novel or contrary to common experience, and then, removing the cause, they are believed to have healed the sick. If any one possessed by a demon be brought before a tribunal, Tertullian affirms that the evil spirit, when ordered by a Christian, will at once confess that he is a demon. The fallen angels were the discoverers of astrology and magic. Unclean spirits hover over waters in imitation of the brooding of the Holy Spirit in the beginning, as, for instance, over dark fountains and solitary streams, and cisterns in baths and dwelling-houses, and similar places, which are said to carry one off (*rapere*), that is to say, by the force of the evil spirit. The fallen angels disclosed to the world unknown material substances and various arts, such as metallurgy, the properties of herbs, incantations, and interpretation of the stars, and to women, especially, they revealed all the secrets of personal adornment. There is scarcely any man who is not attended by a demon; and it is well known that untimely and violent deaths, which are attributed to accidents, are really caused by demons. Those who go to theatres may become specially accessible to demons. There is the instance, the Lord is witness (*domino teste*), of the woman

who went to the theatre and came back possessed by a demon; and, on being cast out, the evil spirit replied that he had a right to act as he did, having found her within his limits. There was another case, also well known, of a woman who, at night, after having been to a theatre, had a vision of a winding-sheet (*linteum*), and heard the name of the tragedian whom she had seen mentioned with reprobation, and five days after the woman was dead" (Supernatural Religion, vol. i, pp. 124–127).

Tertullian repeats with the utmost confidence the story of the Phœnix, "that wonderful bird of Arabia and the adjoining countries, which lives five hundred years; at the end of which time, its dissolution being at hand, it builds a nest of spices, in which it dies. From the decaying flesh, however, a worm is generated, which, being strengthened by the juices of the bird, produces feathers, and is transformed into a Phœnix," which, according to some accounts, "then flies away with the nest containing the bones of its defunct parent to the city of Heliopolis in Egypt, and in full daylight, and in the sight of all men, it lays them on the altar of the sun. On examining the registers, the priests find that the bird has returned precisely at the completion of the five hundred years." By some this bird is also considered as an emblem of the resurrection. Tertullian swallowed it all. And still more, for he mentions, as a recognized fact, that the hyena changes its sex every year, being alternately male and female; and he adds: "I do not mention the stag, since itself is the witness of its own age; feeding upon the serpent, it languishes into youth from the working of the poison."

Once more: Tertullian considers volcanoes to be openings into hell, and asks who will not deem those punishments sometimes inflicted upon mountains as examples of the judgments which menace the wicked.

Furthermore, he speaks with the most perfect assurance of miracles occurring in his day, and of the power of healing and of casting out devils still possessed by Christians in his day. "In one place, for instance, after asserting the power

which they have generally over demons, so that if a person possessed by a devil be brought before one of the Roman tribunals, a follower of Christ can at once compel the wicked spirit within him to confess that he is a demon, even if he had before asserted himself to be a god, he proceeds to say: 'So at our touch and breathing, violently affected by the contemplation and representation of those fires (of hell) they (demons) also depart at our command out of bodies, reluctant and complaining, and put to shame in your presence.' . . . He narrates as an instance of the continued possession of spiritual gifts by Christians: 'There is at this day among us a sister who has the gift of revelations, which she receives in church amidst the solemnities of the Lord's day by ecstacy in the spirit; she converses with angels, and sometimes also with the Lord, and she both hears and sees sacred things, and she reads the hearts of some men, and prescribes medicines to those who are in need.' Tertullian goes on to say that after the people were dismissed from the church, this sister was in the regular habit of reporting what she had seen, and that most diligent inquiries were made in order to test the truth of her communications, and after narrating a vision of a disembodied soul vouchsafed to her, he states: 'This is the vision. God being witness, and the apostle having foretold that such spiritual gifts should be in the Church.' Further on Tertullian relates another story within his own knowledge: 'I know the case of a woman born within the fold of the Church who was in the prime of life and beauty. After being but once, and only a short time, married, having fallen asleep in peace, in the interval before interment, when the presbyter began to pray as she was being made ready for burial, at the first breath of the prayer she removed her hands from her sides, folded them in the attitude of supplication, and again, when the last rites were over, restored them to their former position.' He then mentions another story known amongst them: that a dead body in a cemetery moved itself in order to make room beside it for another body; and then he remarks: 'If similar cases are also reported amongst the heathen, we conclude that

God displays signs of his power for the consolation of his own people, and as a testimony to others.' Again, he mentions cases where Christians had cured persons of demoniacal possession, and adds: 'And how many men of position (for we do not speak of the vulgar) have been delivered either from devils or from diseases!' Tertullian in the same place refers to the miracle of the 'Thundering Legion,' and he exclaims: 'When, indeed, have not droughts been removed by our prayers and fastings?'" (Supernatural Religion, pp. 161–164.)

Enough of this old Father's vulgar credulity and superstition.

And now a word—just one sentence from his writings to exemplify the character of his theological metaphysics. Gnostic or anti-gnostic, it is very rich and rare. Arguing concerning the existence of Deity, he thus expresses himself concerning the "Word:" "God, before the formation of the universe, was not alone; for he had with him and in him his own reason, which Greeks call Logos; and in reason he had speech, which he could make a second principle from himself, by acting within himself."

But perhaps what concerns us most in these days of profane discussions and wicked doubtings about "hell" is what he says about the day of judgment and the destiny of the wicked. Listen! "What a spectacle is at hand in the advent of the Lord—doubted, humbled, withheld from triumph no longer! What joy among the angels! What glory for the saints rising to life! What a kingdom for the just evermore! What a city in the New Jerusalem! It will not be without its games! It will have the final and eternal day of judgment, which the Gentiles now treat with unbelief and scorn; when so vast a series of ages, with all their productions, will be hurled into one absorbing fire! How magnificent the scale of that game! With what admiration, what laughter, what glee, what triumph shall I perceive so many mighty emperors, who had been represented as received up into the skies, even Jupiter himself and his votaries, moaning in unfathom-

able gloom! The governors, too, persecutors of the Christians, liquifying amidst shooting spires of flame, in fiercer torments than they had ever devised against the faithful. And those sage philosophers who had deprived the Deity of his offices, and questioned the existence of a soul, or denied its future union with the body, meeting again with their disciples only to blush before them in those ruddy fires! Not to forget the poets, trembling at the unexpected bar of Christ, not before the tribunal of Rhadamanthus and Minos! Then will be the time to hear the tragedians, doubly pathetic, since they bewail their own agonies; to observe the actors, released by the fierce element from all restraint upon their gestures; to admire the charioteer glowing all over on the car of torture; to watch the wrestlers, thrust into the struggle of the flames instead of the gymnasium. But even the spectacle I shall forego, to revel, with insatiable rage, at the dismay of the Lord's own persecutors! . . . What prætor, consul, or priest, by his munificence, can purchase for you a game of triumph like unto this? Yet we, by the imaginative power of faith, can enjoy a foretaste of it already!"

With this we turn away with unutterable disgust from this great pioneer of all the hell-gloaters of the after ages. We leave Tertullian, all lurid with the hellish glory with which his own depraved imagination has clothed him.

ORIGEN.

Origen was born about A. D. 185. His name is derived from that of an Egyptian deity (Horus or Or). At a very early age his religious enthusiasm passed into fanaticism, and he lead for many years the life of an ascetic, keeping frequent fasts and practicing upon himself works of mortification. At the beginning of his career he perpetrated the act of self-mutilation, in literal observance of Jesus' teaching in Matthew (xix, 12), where he counsels thus: "For there are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb; and there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." Origen believed the Scripture, and knew that it was all-important that he should become a fool for Christ's sake, and to prove his faith and foolishness he made a eunuch of himself, for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He consequently was never disappointed in love, or distracted by family jars, or the embarrassments of a large family, but pursued the even tenor of an old bachelor's way.

He became a great scholar and wrote a vast amount of Church literature. Jerome says that he wrote more than any one individual could read; and Epiphanius relates that his writings amounted to six thousand volumes. At one time by the liberality of Ambrose he was furnished "with more than seven amanuenses, who relieved each other at stated times, and with an equal number of transcribers, along with young girls who had been practiced in calligraphy," to make fair copies for publication, of the works he dictated.

The most critical work of Origen is the Hexapla, or six-columned Bible, an attempt to provide a revised text of the

Septuagint translation of the Old Testament scripture. On this undertaking he is said to have spent twenty-eight years.

The writing which has given prominence to his name in modern times is his treatise in reply to a book written by Celsus, entitled "A True Discourse." Celsus, as a philosopher, brings forward certain objections to Christian doctrines and manner of life, and Origen, after quoting these objections, makes an effort to refute them, but to the most superficial reader it is apparent that in most instances he utterly fails. However, if he cannot refute his arguments, he can call him hard names, and in this, he is a true Christian; for it has ever been the invariable habit of the Christian to abuse his opponent by heaping upon him vile and opprobrious epithets. The foundations of Christian thought, which divide mankind into two great classes, saints and sinners, is an illustration of this fact. It is a base slander to call one man a sinner and another a saint.

Origen begins, by saying: "Our present object, however, is to expose the ignorance of Celsus." And in reply to the quotations he makes from Celsus, he begins by using the following opprobrious epithets, to assist his feeble arguments: "Childish assertions," "Exceedingly weak is his assertion," "Extremely foolish also is his remark," "Superficial as is his objection," "Manifest falsity of such a statement," "Manifest falsehood," "Indescribable silliness," "The charge of falsehood," "Foolish assertions," "This low jester Celsus." In this style all the replies of Origen are disfigured. They display two facts; namely, that although Origen was a great scholar he was not able to meet the objections of Celsus by cogent arguments and hard facts, and, what we always find when we meet an earnest Christian, that he was an intolerant bigot.

Celsus was a contemporary of Origen, although the latter seems to know nothing of him personally, or whether he was living or dead. In the preface to his work against Celsus, he says of him, "Who yet does not even still live the common life among men, but already and long since is dead." Origen

certainly at one time conjectured Celsus to be an Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian. Beyond this belief, founded avowedly on hearsay, Origen absolutely knew nothing whatever as to the personality of Celsus, or the time at which he wrote, and he sometimes very naïvely expresses his uncertainty regarding him. Referring in one place to certain passages which seem to imply a belief in magic on the part of Celsus, Origen says, "I do not know whether he is the same who has written several books against magic." Elsewhere he says: "The Epicurean Celsus, if he be the same who composed two other books against Christians," and so forth.

Not only is it apparent that Origen knew nothing of Celsus —with whom he was dealing—but it is almost impossible to avoid the conviction that during the time he was composing his work his impressions concerning the date and identity of his opponent became considerably modified. In the earlier portion of his first book he appears to have heard that this Celsus is the Epicurean of the reign of Hadrian, but a little further on, as we have just seen, he confesses his ignorance as to whether or not he is the same Celsus who wrote against magic, which Celsus the Epicurean actually did; in the fourth book, as we have just seen, whether or not the Epicurean Celsus had composed the work against Christians which he is refuting, and at the close of his treatise he treats him as a contemporary. He writes to his friend Ambrose, at whose request the refutation of Celsus was undertaken: "Know, however, that Celsus has promised to write another treatise after this one. . . . If, therefore, he has not fulfilled his promise to write a second book, we may be well satisfied with the eight books in reply to his discourse. If, however, he has commenced and finished this work also, seek it and send it in order, that we may answer it also, and confute the false teaching in it."

Many critics of all shades of opinion have long since determined that so far from being an Epicurean, the Celsus attacked by Origen—as the philosophical opinions which he everywhere expresses clearly show—was a Neo-Platonist.

as Mosheim long ago demonstrated, of the school of Ammonious, who founded the sect at the close of the second century. The promise of Celsus to write a second book, with practical rules for living in accordance with the philosophy he promulgates, to which Origen refers at the close of his work, confirms this conclusion and indicates a new and recent system of philosophy. An Epicurean would not have thought of such a work—it would have been both appropriate and necessary in connection with Neo-Platonism. We are, therefore, constrained to assign the work of Celsus at least to the early part of the third century, and to the reign of Septimus Severus.

It is evident that the dates assigned by the apologists are wholly arbitrary, and even if the evidence we have produced were much less conclusive than it is for the later epoch, the total absence of evidence for an earlier date would completely nullify any testimony derived from Celsus.

It is sufficient for us to add that, whilst he refers to incidents of gospel history and quotes some sayings which have parallels, with more or less of variation, in our gospels, Celsus nowhere mentions the name of any Christian book, unless we except the book of Enoch; and he accuses Christians—not without reason—of interpolating the books of the Sibyl, whose authority, he states, some of them acknowledged.

"The doctrines taught by Origen were: 1. That, in the Trinity, the Father is greater than the Son, and the Son greater than the Holy Ghost; 2. The prœexistence of souls, which Origen considered as sent into mortal bodies for the punishment of sins committed in a former state of being; 3. That the soul of Christ was united to the word before the incarnation; 4. That the sun, moon, and stars, and so forth, were animated and endowed with rational souls; 5. That after the resurrection all bodies will be of a round figure; 6. That the torments of the damned will have an end; and that as Christ had been crucified in this world to save mankind he is to be crucified in the next to save the devils."

ST. VICTOR.

THE Romish Church persistently maintains that from St. Peter, who was the first pope of Rome, there has been a regular succession down to the present day. This is beyond all doubt an untenable claim. It is true, bishops have by Church historians been turned into popes, and characters have been invented to fill up the numerous gaps that have taken place in the papal line. Walch, the learned author of a history of the Popes, says: "If we may judge of the Church of Rome by the constitution of other apostolic churches, she could have no particular bishop before the end of the first century. The ancient lists are so contradictory, that it would be impossible exactly to determine either the succession of the bishops or their chronology. Some say that Clemens of Rome had been ordained by the apostle Peter and was his immediate successor. Others place Linus and Cletus between them. A third set name Linus; but instead of Cletus name Anacletus, Anencletus, Dacletius. Lastly a fourth party states the succession thus: Peter, Linus, Cletus, Clemens, Anacletus."

Several of the early fathers, Tertullian, Rufinus and Epiphanius say Clement succeeded Peter. Jerome declares that most of the Latin authors supposed Clement to have been the successor of Peter. But Irenæus, Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine contradict the above authorities and say Linus succeeded Peter. Chrysostom seems to go the same way. Bishop Pearson has proved that Linus died before Peter, and therefore his being a successor of Peter is wholly out of the question.

Dr. Comber, a very learned divine of the Church of

England says: "Upon the whole matter there is no certainty who was the bishop of Rome next to the apostles, and therefore the Romanists build upon an ill bottom when they lay so great weight upon their personal succession . . . . The like blunder there is about the next bishop of Rome. The fabulous pontifical makes Cletus succeed Linus and gives us several lives of Cletus and Anacletus, making them of several nations and to have been popes at different times, putting Clement between them. Yet the bishop of Chester [Pearson] proves these were only two names of the same person And every one may see the folly of the Romish Church which venerates two several saints on two several days, one of which never had a real being, for Cletus is but the abreviation of Anacletus' name."

That great luminary of the Church of England, Archbishop Whately, declared it as his solemn conviction that. "there is not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up, with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree. The ultimate consequence must be that any one who sincerely believes that his claim to the benefits of the gospel covenant depends on his own minister's claim to the supposed sacramental virtue of true ordination, and this again on apostolical succession, must be involved, in proportion as he reads and inquires and reflects and reasons on the subject in the most distressing doubt and perplexity. It is no wonder, therefore, that the advocates of this theory studiously disparage reasoning, deprecate all exercise of the mind in reflection, decry all appeals to evidence, and lament that even the power of reading should be imparted to the people. It is not without cause that, having removed the Christian's confidence from a rock, to base it on sand, they forbid all crying curiosity to examine their foundation."

The claim of the Church that Peter was first bishop or pope of Rome, and that from him there has been a regular and unbroken succession is wholly without foundation and cannot be sustained except by manufactured testimony. There is no mention in the New Testament that Peter ever was in Rome.

But if he was, there is no proof whatever, that he was bishop of Rome, or that he had any particular connection with the Church or churches of that city, any more than Paul or any other of the apostles. But even if he was bishop of Rome, where is the proof that he claimed any supremacy over other bishops? But supposing, still further, that during his life he was the first supreme head of the Church on earth, still it is impossible to prove the unbroken line of his successors, especially the more immediate ones. But, finally, supposing even this could have been proven, what of the long line of "apostolical successors" who were—as we will see further along, monsters of vice, crime, and iniquity.

The unbroken line of papal succession was merely an afterthought of later time. Previous to the year 606 there was properly no pope. The term *pope* or *papa*—father—had of course been used before that date, but not in the same meaning as in more modern times. It was applied to many dignitaries of the Church much as "father" is now indiscriminately applied to the Romish clergy of all ages and degrees. When we say, therefore, that previous to the year 606 there was no pope, we mean of course in the present exclusive sense of the word, as the supreme sovereign pontiff and boasted head of the universal Church. Until the year named, notwithstanding the prior origin of many papal corruptions, popery, or the Roman Catholic religion in its present form as a distinct and compacted system had no existence. The year 606 may be regarded as the epoch of its origin and birth.

In the year 192 Victor became bishop of Rome. Prior to this time the greatest uncertainty rests upon those claimed by the Church to have been promoted to that position. Victor was an African by birth, and his father's name was Felix. The apostate, Theodotus, having returned into the bosom of the Church, became the chief of a new sect, which caused great scandal at the commencement of Victor's term. The doctrine was taught by Theodotus that Jesus Christ was only human, and his disciples

published it abroad that Bishop Victor thought the same was true. The bishop, however, put an end to this charge by excommunicating Theodotus, with Arteman, his disciple, who then formed a new sect. Victor, at the same time, condemned the old errors of Albion and other heretics, who seemed anxious, through the reign of peace which the Church then enjoyed, to revive their heresies.

Infallibility had not yet been established as a dogma of the Church, and Victor allowed himself to be seduced by the heretical notions of the Montanists. Tertullian, who had declared in favor of these innovations, assures us that Bishop Victor approved of the prophecies of Montanus, and of the two women, Maximilla and Priscilla, who followed him.

Another heresy soon after broke out in the Church. Praxeas, who had aided in the proscription of the prophecies of Montanus, invented patripassianism, which destroyed the distinctions of the persons of the Deity. Victor attacked this new schism and held a council at Rome, which condemned Praxeas, who was forced to acknowledge his error.

Not far from this time occurred the celebrated struggle in relation to the festival of Easter. Previous to this time there had been little interest manifested upon the subject; but when the question was agitated, Victor unjustly claimed a right of superiority over his brethren, and wrote to the churches of Asia very vehement letters, threatening them with excommunication if they did not embrace his views, and in various ways showed the same spirit of intolerance for which afterwards the Church became so distinguished.

The conduct of the bishop of Rome displeased a great number of other bishops, even those who opposed the views of the Asiatics, and they refused to adhere to the opinions of Victor, and felt that they possessed sufficient power and independence to tell the pastor of Rome what they thought of his pretensions and assumptions in the very sharpest language. Irenæus is claimed to have written a letter of reprimand to Victor for the course he had pursued.

The bishop was obliged to greatly modify his heavy rule.

He had the matter in him for a despot, but the time had not then arrived for the bishop of Rome to become pope absolute, and, with an iron rule, to crush all before him.

It is claimed for him by some Church authorities that he suffered martyrdom about the year 202, but this is very uncertain, as the martyrologies, in the name of St. Jerome, only bestow on him the title of Confessor.

ST. ANTHONY.

This famous saint—especially famous wherever and whenever St. Anthony's fire is stalking like a pestilence abroad—was born in Egypt in the year 251. Disposing of his property and giving the proceeds to the poor, he retired to the desert, and, owing to his reputed sanctity, attracted many disciples. He thus formed the first monastic community, and is regarded as the originator of the religious orders of the East. He afterwards, at Alexandria, sought martyrdom amid the persecutions of the Christians there prevailing; but his life was spared, and he returned to the desert, where he dwelt until his death. All his conduct indicates a fervent and melancholy imagination. That he used no garments but a shirt made of hair, and a sheep's skin, and never washed his body, is more credible than the strange stories of his contests with devils and the wonders related in his life by St. Athanasius. And, by the by, what a dirty and disgusting set of pietists most of the old monks were. In their view, following several pre-Christian Oriental teachers and sects, the body was only a vile, sinful, almost diabolical tabernacle for the immaterial soul, and the more mortification, abuse, and indignity heaped upon it, the more dirty and noisome it was kept, the more it was frozen or scorched or wounded, or tormented in numberless ways; in fact, the more bestial and cruel and devilish one's treatment of his body, the more ethereal and heavenly the soul would become, and the fitter it would be for an introduction into the heavenly mansions, to bear company with the altogether lovely Jesus and his blessed virgin mother—our Lady of Heaven—and other celebrated ladies and gentlemen of the New Jerusalem, which, of course,

was all paved and bedecked in the splendor of thrice-refined gold and rarest gems and jewels of all celestial hues, and cooled with cleansing fountains innumerable, all springing from under the great white throne of God, who, we have not the least doubt, is a very clean person himself, when not dabbling in blood.

The visions of this monk, rather than his piety, rendered him celebrated among the anchorites of his age, and gave him an immense reputation for holiness, which extended over to the extremity of Gaul. Although he could neither read nor write, St. Anthony has left many works, which he dictated, in the Egyptian language, to his disciples; among others, seven letters, filled with the true apostolic spirit, which were translated first into Greek and then into Latin. In the midst of the extravagant and incoherent recitals of his ecstacies and his temptations, we have been struck with the singular revelation which it is said he had a few days before his death, and which has been transmitted to us by one of his disciples: "The holy man was seated," thus goes the legend, "when the Divine Spirit descended upon him. Then he entered into an ecstacy, his eyes raised to heaven, and his attention fixed. He remained for five hours in complete immobility, groaning from time to time; at length he fell upon his knees. We all, seized with dread, besought him to tell us the subject of his tears. 'Oh! my children,' replied he, 'the wrath of God will fall upon the Church; we will be delivered over to men like to unclean beasts; for I have seen the holy table surrounded by mules and asses, which overturned the altars of Christ by rude kicks, and which defiled the sacred body of the Savior! I heard a voice cry out, Thus my altar shall be profaned by abominable ministers, who shall call themselves the successors of the apostles.'"

Whether or not we believe that the saint saw all this in a prophetic vision, it was certainly only a too correct prevision of the horrible times that were even then at the door.

Anthony is said to have died at the age of one hundred and five years.

ST. PAUL THE HERMIT.

In every religion that has ever been embraced by mankind, sacrifice and mortification have been held necessary to the attainment of sanctity. Comfort has been considered sinful, pleasure profane. To seclude themselves among the rugged rocks of some solitary waste, or bury themselves in the gloomy depths of some trackless forest; to make themselves revolting, and adopt the ways of wild animals; to divest themselves of decent dress, and assume an apparel uncouth and uncomfortable; to crawl into caves in the earth; to live under trees, or upon the tops of poles and pillars; to ally themselves with the brute creation, and render themselves as filthy and disgusting as possible; to subject themselves to bodily torture; to extinguish the last faint glimmer of genius and intellect, and to scorn the society of human beings—such were considered by the ancient Christian anchorites as the surest means of securing the sanctification of the soul and the reward of everlasting happiness. A credulous and superstitious world has always considered self-inflicted suffering the most meritorious act of piety.

Asceticism, with all the gloomy characteristics of monkery, had a heathen origin. It sprang from the rank soil of Egypt, the prolific parent of many of the religions of earth. It was there, long before the coming of Christ, that those dismal and rigid sects, the Essenes and Therapeutæ, had their rise and habitation. All the ancient contemporary writers speak of the gymnosophists as practicers of the most painful penances and austerities. They, like their subsequent Christian imitators, went nearly naked, occupied caverns and chinks in the rocks, professed chastity and abstinence, and passed their time in mute meditation.

In the course of time the Egyptian system of monkery came under the more powerful influence of Christianity. The only material modifications it underwent were the adoption of a few phrases in another dialect. Only these distinguished the Christian anchorite from the Egyptian gymnosophist. The most rigid of the Christian devotees dispensed with all dress except a rug or a few palm-leaves about the loins. They never changed their garments, and made no use of water for ablution. It is related that St. Anthony bequeathed to Athanasius a skin in which his sacred person had been wrapped for half a century. They allowed their beards and nails to grow, and frequently became so covered with hair as to be actually mistaken for wild beasts.

Paul, commonly called the Hermit, affords one of the most remarkable instances of this foolish fanaticism. The career of this devotee was between the years 250 and 340. During the persecution under Decius he betook himself to the solitary deserts of Egypt, where, for more than ninety years, he lived the life of a savage animal rather than that of a human being. He was really the founder of the Christian monastic institutions, though Anthony, an Egyptian, who lived some thirty years later, has usually been given this credit. These are the only reliable facts that can be accurately ascertained concerning his personal history. The institution that he was instrumental in founding has survived all the generations that have come and gone since his time, and the wreck of many a realm and splendid dynasty. It appears that he was a strange fanatic, who, by a course of conduct only consistent with that of an idiot or lunatic, has secured an eminent rank among the saints and champions of a corrupt and degenerate Church.

STEPHEN I.

THE spirit of strife seems to have been an accompaniment of the progress of Christianity. The religion of the Man of Peace, even in its embryotic state deposited seeds of discord that soon convulsed all the East with Christian combat. The founders and early Fathers of the Church were mostly fierce and fanatical men, always ready to fight for the glory of one who had come on earth to bring tidings of peace and good will to men. They fought with each other because they were not yet strong enough to persecute those outside the faith. Dissensions arose in the days of the tent-maker of Tarsus. The early councils were scenes of contention. Wrangling prelates fell foul of each other, and ferocious bishops and patriarchs kicked each other to death for Christ's sake. Rival councils set their slaughtering soldiery upon each other, and for centuries riot and bloodshed, outrage and assassination filled Antioch, Alexandria, Chalcedon, Constantinople, and all the great capitals of the East with anarchy, pious plunder, and pillage. From Peter, who smote off an ear with the sword, to his last successor invested with the triple crown, the heads and rulers of the Church have been, with few exceptions, turbulent and ungovernable bigots.

The subject of this sketch occupies a prominent place in this list of lordly and exasperated ecclesiastics. He is enumerated the twenty-fourth pope in the Catholic catalogue; but, as has been already shown, there was properly no pope till 606. This Stephen was a Roman by birth, and the son of a priest named Julius. He was chosen bishop in 253 as a recompense for services rendered the Church. He was a haughty and imperious person, and it was not long after the

beginning of his pontificate that a dispute arose between him and Cyprian, bishop of Carthage in Africa. Two Spanish bishops, Basilicus of Leon, and Martial of Merida, had been deposed on accusation of enormous crimes which made them unworthy of their episcopates. They went to Rome and prevailed on Stephen to reëstablish them. This they did by promising their aid to increase the power of the holy Father, who reinstated them without even an examination of the charges against them. The Spanish clergy felt scandalized at this proceeding and sent deputies to the bishops of Africa to ask their aid against the ambition of the Roman pontiff. A council of twenty-eight prelates was immediately assembled by Cyprian, which confirmed the deposition of the two bishops. Cyprian sent two priests to Rome to inform Stephen of the action of the African church. He, however, would neither see them nor speak with them, and prohibited the faithful from receiving them or giving them the rites of hospitality. In his excessive wrath he broke communion with the African bishops, and excluded them from the communion of the Church of Rome. He behaved with the utmost fury and arrogance toward the Asiatic Christians, and wrote to them in an insolent and menacing manner. This, of course, excited the indignation of the Orientals, and the ecclesiastical rancor ran high.

Firmilianus, bishop of Cæsarea, in a letter to Cyprian, wrote of Stephen in these words: "Can we believe that this man has a soul and a body? Apparently his body is crooked and his mind disordered. He does not fear to speak of his brother Cyprian as a false Christ, a false prophet, a fraudulent workman; and in order not to be understood as speaking from himself, he has the audacity to reproach him in the name of others."

Cyprian replied to the notification of Stephen with equally bitter invectives, and in a second council at Carthage confirmed the course of the Asiatic Christians. When news of this reached Stephen his choler burst all bounds. He issued a decree reeking with the most violent threatenings and dis-

graceful denunciations. The quarrel apparently related only to the efficacy of baptism administered by heretics, but was really a conflict of authority among contentious and ambitious bishops.

At that early age the bishop of Rome was traveling, step by step, toward that eminence of spiritual and worldly domination, which, attained three centuries later by an humble pastor on the banks of the Tiber, gave him the prerogative of being the vicegerent of God upon earth.

The above facts show that as late as the year 256, when the Council of Carthage was held, the views of the bishop of Rome were disregarded when they conflicted with the views of other bishops; and that St. Cyprian, as he is now called by Romanists themselves, could treat his decrees with contempt without forfeiting his title to the honors of subsequent canonization. At length Stephen went the way of all flesh, and the violent controversy between him and the African bishops came to an end.

His death took place in 257. Historians disagree as to the manner of his death. Some state that after suffering banishment with St. Cyprian and returning to his church he was arrested and beheaded on the public square. Others relate that he was thrown to wild beasts in the circus by the Emperor Valerian, but by the miraculous fall of a temple of Mars, which put his guard to flight, he was enabled to escape into a neighboring cemetery. The soldiers afterwards found him and cut off his head upon the altar where he was offering sacrifice. But the opinion of the learned is that he died in prison in the fourth year of his pontificate. His ecclesiastical career serves to show how, in the first centuries of Christianity, prelates and dignitaries of the Church mingled in their disputes that violence and vindictive venom which have always characterized religious contests.

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

Flavius Valerius Aurelius, better known in history as Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor of Rome, was born at Naissus, in Dacia, A. D. 272. His father was the emperor Constantius Chlorus; and his mother, Helena, according to some authorities, was the daughter of a British king, while other traditions represent her as having been the daughter of an innkeeper. When he was eighteen years of age his father was elevated to the rank of Cæsar. This fortunate event was followed by the divorce of Helena —Constantius after his promotion having sought the splendor of an imperial alliance. Constantine shared the disgrace and humiliation of his mother. Entering the service of Diocletian, who had abdicated the imperial dignity, he soon signalized his valor in the wars of Persia and Egypt, and ere long rose to the rank of a tribune of the first order.

Although early distinguished by the profession of arms, he showed but little inclination for study and the improvement of his mind. In person he was tall and majestic; he is described as dexterous in all the military exercises, intrepid in battle, and affable in peace; cold and insensible to the allurements of pleasure, his whole conduct was tempered by prudence, and his mind entirely engrossed by ambition. His talents, courage, and martial services rendered him a favorite of the army and an object of jealousy to Galerius, the emperor who shared with his father the administration of Rome.

Apprehending the sure and secret revenge of his imperial foe, young Constantine left the palace of Nicodemia in the night, and traveled with such incredible diligence through

Bithynia, Thrace, Dacia, Pannonia, Italy, and Gaul, as to frustrate any attempt Galerius might make to overtake him. Amidst the joyful acclamations of the people, he safely reached the port of Boulogne, and joined his father at the very moment he was preparing to embark for Britain. The result of the British expedition was a victory over the barbarians of Caledonia. This closed the military career of Constantius. Fifteen months after he had received the title of Augustus, and fourteen years after he had been promoted to the rank of Cæsar, he ended his life in the imperial palace of York.

The soldiers who had followed Constantius into Britain showed their esteem for their beloved emperor by immediately saluting his son with the titles with which he had been invested. The throne had ever been the object of Constantine's ambition; and now it was his only means of safety. He was sufficiently acquainted with the character of Galerius to know that if he would live he must determine to reign. Receiving the acclamations of the flower of the western armies which had followed his father to Britain, he justified himself in usurping the imperial purple, without so much as soliciting it in the regular and constitutional manner.

By his second wife, Theodora, Constantius had six children, three of either sex. These children of royal extraction claimed a preference over the son of the divorced Helena to the succession of their father. At this time Constantine was in the thirty-second year of his age, in the full vigor of both body and mind, while the eldest of his brothers was not more than thirteen years old.

Soon after the death of Constantius, Rome became divided into hostile powers, and became the theatre of revolt and war. At one time, and the only time in its history, six emperors ruled its vast territory.

Constantine formed an alliance with Maximian, one of the most powerful contestants for the throne, by the marriage of his daughter Fausta. The nuptials were celebrated at Arles, in France, with every circumstance of magnificence. After abdicating the imperial purple the second time, Maximian at

last sought refuge in the court of Constantine; but when an incursion of the Franks had summoned the latter with a part of his army to the banks of the Rhine, the crafty Maximian spread a report of the death of his son-in-law, seized the treasure, and ascended the throne. Upon the first news of the perfidy of his father-in-law, Constantine returned by such rapid marches to the gates of Arles as left Maximian no time for the establishment of his authority, or even for resistance. He was obliged to withdraw to the neighboring city of Marseilles. Without delay Constantine immediately assaulted the city. The garrison purchased their pardon by delivering up the city and the person of Maximian, against whom sentence of death was pronounced, and who was allowed the favor of strangling himself with his own hands. Had Constantine possessed the humanity to have spared this old man, who had twice been emperor of Rome, who had been the benefactor of his father, and who was the father of his wife, he would have been more justly deserving of the title "Great." Notwithstanding the murder of Maximian, and the slaughter of the barbarous Franks and Alemanni, whose captured kings he caused to be thrown to wild beasts in the amphitheatre of Treves for his diversion, the reign of Constantine in Gaul seems to have been the most innocent and virtuous period of his life. It will thus be seen at the outset that the virtues of this first of Christian emperors were not such as to render him illustrious.

At length, the deaths of Maximian and Galerius reduced the number of emperors to four. At this period of its history, Rome comprised all the possessions of the Grand Seignor of the present day, except Arabia; all that the house of Austria possesses in Germany, and all the German provinces as far as the Elbe; Italy, France, Spain, England, and half of Scotland; all Africa as far as the Great Desert, and even the Canary Isles. Epirus, Macedonia, Thessaly, Illyria, Pannonia, Asia Minor, the African coasts, and countries which are at present nearly barbarous and deserted, were then populous and well governed. It was the ambition of Constantine to confirm and

enlarge the immense power of all these nations, and reduce them all to his single yoke.

It was while marching to Rome to fight Maxentius, one of the surviving rival emperors, that, according to that Christian falsifier, Eusebius, Constantine was converted to Christianity by a miraculous vision. This was the appearance in the clouds of the grand imperial standard surmounted by a large Greek R, with a cross, and certain Greek words which signified, "By this sign thou shalt conquer." This is said to have happened in the year 312. It would have been more consistent had this vision appeared in Italy upon a day of battle, with the inscription in Latin instead of Greek. But, of course, only Infidels are allowed to discredit this pious narrative. Maxentius was defeated and killed near Rome.

At length only one rival remained, his brother-in-law, Licinius, Emperor of the East; but gaining a complete victory over him at Adrianople, and having treacherously caused him to be put to death, in violation of his imperial pledge of safety, Constantine was left the sole master of the Roman world. By the most treacherous, bloody, unscrupulous, and cruel course of conduct he had triumphed over all the rival claimants to the throne, and had at last attained the object of his ambition. Murder, assassination, and wholesale slaughter had marked his career. He had attained undisputed supremacy over the great empire of Rome, both in the East and West. And now he wished to offer an expiation for his crimes. He applied to pagan priests and pontiffs. They told him that in their religion there was no atonement for such guilt as his; but they referred him to the then obscure sect of Christians who undertook to guarantee complete absolution for the greatest enormities through the merits of the blood of an innocent victim. And so Constantine made an open profession of Christianity—but without becoming strictly a Christian himself, for at that time baptism was essential to any person's becoming one; and Constantine, probably with the hope that he might continue committing crime with impunity, delayed the act of immersion till near the point of his

death. By thus waiting till the approach of death he doubtless expected, according to Christian teaching, to expiate at once, in the water of regeneration, the guilt and bloodshed of a lifetime. Oh, the most unfortunate event that ever befell the human race was the adoption of Christianity by this crimson-handed cut-throat in the possession of uncontrolled power!

The first legal enactment for the observance of the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, was made by him. The edict was given A. D. 321, and was worded as follows: "Let all judges and people of the towns (or cities) rest, and all the various trades be suspended on the venerable day of the sun (*venerabile die solis*). Those who live in the country, however, may freely and without fault attend to the cultivation of their fields (since it often happens that no other day be so suitable for sowing grain and planting the vine), lest, with the loss of favorable opportunity, the commodities offered by divine Providence should be destroyed."

And as he must be master in everything, so he must be master in the Church. Accordingly, in 325, he convoked and opened the celebrated Council of Nice, the first general council in ecclesiastical history. He had murdered his father-in-law, had cut the throat of his twelve-year-old nephew, and the very year that he convened the first great Christian council he beheaded his eldest son, Crispus, and suffocated in a bath of boiling water his wife, Fausta. In the words of an old Gallic author, "He loved to make a clean house." And after having caused seven members of his family to be put to death in cold blood, after having steeped his soul in the guilt of every crime, from private assassination to wholesale massacre, he called together the Christian world at Nicea; and with the diadem upon his brow, covered over with jewels, seated on high in a golden chair, the first Christian emperor proceeded to settle the orthodox creed and determine the will of God for the centuries to come. In answer to the call of Constantine, two thousand and forty-eight bishops, all of different sentiments and opinions, met at the town of Nicea, in Bithynia. The main object of this council was to decide the

dispute between Athanasius, Deacon of Alexandria, and Arius, an Eastern schismatic, viz., whether Jesus Christ was God or creature, and to settle the canon of Scripture. Of course, this meeting of two thousand violent and exasperated bishops, each intensely interested in having his own peculiar opinions prevail, resulted in a general quarrel; and to restore harmony. Constantine, as moderator, expelled seventeen hundred and thirty of the delegates, thus leaving only three hundred and eighteen to settle the vexed question whether God the Son was the same as God the Father, as well as what writings were the word of God. "This was done," says one authority, "by placing all the books under a communion table, and upon the prayers of the council, the inspired books jumped upon the table, while the false ones remained under."

But after a time, this seems to have proved a failure; the majority began to mock at the method, and the holy wrangling was renewed fiercer than before. They were then submitted to vote, each manuscript being subjected to two ballots: 1. Whether genuine, or written by the person whose name it bore; 2. Whether authentic—that is, whether its subject matter was true.

Out of fifty gospels submitted, only four—viz., Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—were admitted, and those by varying votes. Luke passed by only a majority of one. Had one more voter been kicked out of the council the Christian world would have been minus an inspired book.

Subsequent councils received, as canonical, books rejected at Nice. One council would restore a book thrown out in a previous one. "Thus," says a writer, "were the 'sacred writings,' the 'word of God,' tossed like a battledoor from sect to sect, and altered as the spirit of faction might dictate." As illustrating the spirit that actuated the "ordained heads" at these councils, the following is quoted from Tindal, the great Christian writer: "Indeed, the confusion and disorder were so great amongst them (the bishops), especially in their synods, that it sometimes came to *blows;* as, for instance, Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, *cuffed* and *kicked* Flavianus,

Patriarch of Constantinople, with that fury that within three days after *he died.*" And speaking of their doctrinal consistency, he says: "For though they were most obstinate as to *power*, they were most flexible in regard to *faith;* and in their council complimented the emperor with whatsoever creeds they had a mind to, and never scrupled to *recant* what they had before enacted, or re-enact what they had before recanted."

From the fact that from the Council of Nice (325) to the end of that century there were thirty-eight councils called to settle the matter of controversy between Arius and Athanasius, and that nineteen of said councils decided in favor of the doctrines of the former, and nineteen—precisely the same number—declared in favor of the doctrines of the latter, the inference is that the authority of the Fathers, after all, was not final in the establishment of the true faith.

The Nicene Council ratified the creed of Athanasius, and condemned that of Arius. Constantine gave his imperial sanction to this decision, and set the seal of the empire upon the books there declared by ballot to be the "word of God."

He also issued an edict declaring that those who resisted the divine judgment of the synod must prepare themselves for an immediate exile. Eusebius of Nicodemia, for his wavering assent, was disgraced and exiled. The impious Arius was banished into one of the remote provinces of Illyricum; his person and disciples were branded by law with odious names; his writings were condemned to the flames, and capital punishment was denounced against those in whose possession they should be found.

The emperor had now imbibed the genuine Christian spirit, which has ever been one of persecution and intolerance; and the angry, sarcastic style of his edicts was designed to inspire his subjects with the hatred which he had conceived against the enemies of Jesus Christ. But notwithstanding his zeal for the propagation of the new religion, it does not appear that he attempted any penance or expiation for his unparalleled crimes and cruelties. It was at Rome that he had exercised his most savage enormities.

In the jurisprudence of Rome the person of a citizen had always been considered sacred from the application of the torture. Through all the annals of tyranny, from the reign of Tiberius to that of the first Christian emperor, the last hours of a Roman citizen were sacred from the danger of ignominious torture. But during the reign of Constantine there was no privileged exemption from the torments of the dreaded rack. Slaves and citizens, plebians and princes, the dignity of age and the tenderness of youth, were alike exposed to the most cruel tortures; and the terrors of a malicious information, which might select them as the accomplices, or even as the witnesses, perhaps of an imaginary crime, perpetually hung over the heads of the principal citizens of Rome. He put to death so many individuals of rank, in addition to the assassination of so many of his friends and relatives, that Rome at last cried out against him; he was openly insulted by the populace in the streets; placards were put upon the palace gates denouncing him as the second Nero: his residence at Rome ere long became hateful to him, and he quit it forever. He proceeded to the East to lay the foundations of a city that would rival Rome, a city destined to perpetuate his name, and to survive his empire and his religion.

The winding channel through which the waters of the Euxine flow with a rapid and incessant course toward the Mediterranean, became celebrated in the history of antiquity by the name of the Bosphorus. At an obtuse point commanding the opposite shores of Europe and Asia, where the waves of the Thracian Bosphorus meet and repel each other, stood olden Byzantium. Strongly guarded by nature, but yet on every side accessible to the benefits of commercial intercourse, its advantages and incomparable position had been contemplated and described by the historians of antiquity many centuries before the reign of Constantine. The place appears to have been formed by nature for the center and capital of a great empire. Here where it is said the Romans derived their fabulous origin, where every prospect

of beauty, of safety, and of wealth seemed united in a single spot, Constantine determined to erect a city that should be an eternal monument of his name and reign, and that should be the mistress of the luxurious East, as Rome had been of the West. In the interminable forests that overshadowed the shores of the Euxine, and the celebrated quarries of white marble in the little island of Proconnesus, were inexhaustible materials; and the wealth, the labor, and the genius of millions were at his command.

And so he commenced the building of Constantinople in 327, "by the command of God," he says in one of his rescripts. But it is probable if any God ever gave him a command, it would have been not to assassinate his wife and son. Some estimate may be formed of the expense bestowed by the master of Rome on the foundation of the city of his imperial residence, by the allowance of two millions five hundred thousand pounds for the construction of the walls, the porticos and the aqueducts.

Like Rome, the city of Constantine occupied seven hills. The Bosphorus and the Hellespont were the two gates, which could always be closed against a naval enemy, or opened to the fleets of commerce. The buildings of the new city were executed by the best artificers that imperial liberality could procure, and were decorated by the hands of the most celebrated masters of the age of Pericles and Alexander. Unable to revive the genius of Phidias and Lysippus, his rapacious vanity prompted him to appropriate their immortal productions; and by his commands the cities of Greece and Asia were despoiled of their most valuable ornaments. Constantine urged the progress of the work with the impatience of a lover, and the walls, the porticos, and the principal edifices were completed in a few years, or, according to some accounts, in a few months.

At length the founder prepared to celebrate the dedication of the city, and to consecrate it to the virgin mother of God. The games and pomp of this memorable festival were such as may not be described. Constantine caused a statue of him-

self to be framed of gilt wood, and this, bearing in its right hand a small image of the genius of the place, was drawn in a triumphal car, accompanied by guards carrying white tapers and clothed in the richest apparel, upon each returning birthday of the city. When this arrived opposite the throne of the reigning emperor, he rose from his seat, and with grateful reverence adored the memory of his predecessor. At the festival of the dedication, an edict, engraved on a column of marble, bestowed the title of Second or New Rome on the city of Constantine. But the name of Constantinople has ever since prevailed, and after the revolution of fifteen centuries, still perpetuates the name of its founder.

In order to people his new seat of empire at the expense of the ancient capital, Constantine induced the noblest Roman families, the most opulent senators, the equestrian order and their innumerable attendants, to repair thither. Indeed, it has been said that he built houses for them on the exact model of their Roman palaces, and gratified them with an agreeable surprise. He assigned his favorites lands and pensions for the support of their dignity. He alienated the demesnes of Pontus and Asia to grant hereditary estates to the citizens of the new city. As an encouragement to strangers, plebians, frequent and regular distributions of wine and oil, of corn, bread, money, and provisions were made with such prodigality as almost exempted the poorest from the necessity of labor.

An annual tribute of corn imposed on Egypt was applied to feed the lazy populace of the Christian capital. The emperor ordered that the fleet of Alexandria should transport to Constantinople the grain which had before supplied Rome during four months of the year. The result of these regulations was a rapid increase of the population. New piles of buildings were hurriedly crowded together, scarcely affording space in the narrow streets for the perpetual throng of men, of horses and carriages; and in less than a century Constantinople disputed with Rome itself for preëminence in riches and luxury and numbers. Soon after the age of Con-

stantine a separation was made of the two empires, Rome being the capital of the western, and Constantinople of the eastern. The eastern empire endured many centuries after the fall of the western.

A few years before his death, the Christian emperor espoused the cause of the Arians; in fact he became an Arian himself, recalled the banished bishops, rebuilt their churches, and favored the sect that had hitherto been the object of his bitterest persecution. At the mature age of sixty-four, after a short illness, Constantine ended his memorable career in 337, at the palace Aquyrion, in the suburbs of Nicodemia, whither he had retired for the benefit of the air and the warm baths. He had celebrated the thirtieth year of his reign. None of his predecessors since Augustus had ruled Rome for so long a period. His corpse was carried to the city which was destined to preserve his name and memory as its founder. His body was adorned with the vain symbols of greatness, the purple and the diadem, and was deposited on a golden bed in one of the apartments of the palace, which had been splendidly furnished and illuminated for that purpose. The demonstrations of mourning surpassed those practiced on any previous occasion. The empire was divided between his three sons, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans.

And now, we will submit to the just judgment of impartial history the character and career of the first of the Christian emperors. That he had some of the qualities of a great statesman and general is not gainsaid; but that he was a saint and a paragon of perfection, as some of his pious apologists fain would have us believe, will never be admitted by any who read the history of Rome. He built Constantinople; but it was at the expense of, and in order to revenge himself upon, the Eternal City. In founding the Eastern capital, he planted the germs of rivalry and dissension that resulted in the division of the empire; and his political policy contributed more toward the ruin of Rome than the irruptions of the Northern barbarians. In establishing Christianity and

giving it the guaranty of government, he imposed upon after generations the greatest curse that ever afflicted the human race. Christ declared that he came not to bring peace but a sword. Peter, the rock upon which he established his Church, smote off an ear with the sword. That was the extent of the power of the Church in Peter's time—to strike off ears. But that imperial parricide, Constantine, established the Church upon the throne of the great Roman world, and committed to its greedy clutch the sword of universal empire. Christ's name has been a synonym for blood ever since. Says John Alberger, in his "Monks and Popes:" "Had Constantine the Great, though frenzied with ambition and crimsoned with guilt, beheld the boundless ocean of gore which was destined to flow from an incorporation of Christianity with the civil power, and to roll its heavy surge over all future time, he would have been more obdurate than a fiend had he not cowled his head in horror at the frightful vision, and dropped in mercy the pen already inked to inaugurate the tremendous catastrophe."

And now, what of the character of this most celebrated of Christians? Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Christian historians thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Romans iii, 7. ("For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my *lie* unto his glory, why yet should I also be judged as a sinner?"), will tell us that he was a great and a good man. The gratitude of Christians have invented virtues for, and excused the crimes of, this powerful patron of their religion with all the extravagance of pious flattery. He has been considered by them almost equal to the apostles. The Church is certainly more indebted to him than to any other man. No other potentate ever did so much for the cause of Christ. Charlemagne cut the throats of four thousand five hundred Saxons in one day because they would not be baptized. This measure, though it abolished the Saxons, still did not add numerically to the strength of the Church. But Constantine pursued a better policy. He bought candidates for baptism. He purchased souls for salvation at an easy rate. He saved

sinners through the merits of a gift enterprise. A white garment and twenty pieces of gold were the premiums promised by the emperor to every baptized convert. In one year twelve thousand men were baptized at Rome, besides a proportionate number of women and children. No wonder the Church cherishes his memory.

But though the Church has decorated Constantine with every attribute of a saint and a hero; though he was placed by the Senate of Rome among the gods, and by the Christians of the East among the saints, he stands out in the light of authentic facts a murderous monster, and the most abhorred tyrant whose vices and cruelties ever dishonored the imperial purple. To learn the true character of Constantine, inquire of Julian, of Zosimus, of Sozomen, and of Victor. They say he was cruel, ambitious, and sanguinary; that he was a prodigal, a sensualist, and a public robber. He was all these, but still a Christian. He was, as already related, the murderer of his father in-law, his brother-in-law, his nephew, his son, and his wife—all this, but still a zealous propagator of Christianity. The truth and candor of history will yet compel the Christian world to blush for shame at the character and career of this most infamous and conspicuous Champion of the Church.

EUSEBIUS.

THE FATHER OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

We read of two eminent persons of the name of Eusebius, who lived in the same age, the dates of the birth of each having been lost, both distinguished by learning and genius, both honored as bishops, the one of Nicomedia, the other of Cæsarea, both Arians, and members of the Council of Nice, and both dying about the same time—A. D. 340 and 342.

The subject of this essay is Eusebius Pamphili. He is said to have adopted the name Pamphili from his friend and co-worker Pamphilus, the presbyter, scholar, martyr, and saint, of Beyrout in Syria; though it is believed that he was a native of the province of Pamphylia, and, therefore, so named.

He was consecrated Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine about the year 314, and continued in office twenty-six years, until his death, about A. D. 340.

Eusebius was the favored author who was selected by the Emperor Constantine the Great to write his biography. The contents of that work indicate more of the character of the bishop writer than of the emperor subject. It is a fulsome panegyric directly calculated to flatter the august personage in return for the many benefits he had conferred on the Christian Church. In the course of his narration quite a number of facts are preserved from oblivion by the author bishop that have not met with like favor from any other writer. For these and other similar fortunate services to the Church, the Church is very much indebted to the faithful Eusebius. It is for these services that he has been honored and so widely known for so many ages as the "Father of Church history."

It is somewhat remarkable that Eusebius, of all the writers and workers in the then new religion who were concerned in the controversies that occasioned the Council of Nice, should have been the only one whose works should outlive his age. No other known writer of that age so much as mentions, even by name or character, directly or in allusion, the Church, its bishops, its institutes, or events. From Eusebius alone all our knowledge of the early ages of the Christian Church is derived. We have, therefore, to exercise a little caution as to his credibility as an author, and may have to sift some chaff from the garnered wheat.

Among the literary remains of this gifted author there are named, "The Universal Chronicle," in fifteen books; and a sequel to it, "The Truth of the Gospel Demonstrated," in twenty books, ten of which have been lost; a work "Against Hierocles, Governor of Bithynia;" "The Ecclesiastical History from the Christian Era to A. D. 324;" "The Onomasticon, or Cities and Places in Palestine;" "Expositions of Scripture;" "Fourteen Sermons;" "The Life of Constantine the Great;" "A History of Martyrs in Palestine," in eight books; "A Harmony of the Four Gospels," and many other works which have not been preserved.

The Chronicon is the pioneer work in a peculiar field, and that is, the mutilation of history in the interest of the Church. That he might please the Emperor Constantine. Eusebius did what Josephus says the Greeks were famous for having done, namely, "the writing of fabulous narrations; some of them endeavored to please the cities or the kings by writing in their commendation" (See Josephus, Apion i, 5), and in so doing he originated the systematic theory of synchronisms. Baron Bunsen says (Egypt, vol. i, p. 200): "Eusebius had undertaken, in a very unscrupulous and arbitrary spirit, to mutilate history;" and Prof. John W. Draper also says that Eusebius is guilty of this offense. Perhaps the most remarkable of all these forgeries, however, is that of the passage attributed to Josephus, because, even in educated quarters, it is still held forth as an admission, on the part of

the great Jewish historian, of the truth of the claims of Jesus. The reader will be in the end, if he is not now, prepared to give its due credit to the famous passage in Josephus (Ant. xviii, 3, §3) concerning Jesus, which was added by Eusebius to the original text. No less a man than Dr. Lardner, one of the strongest supporters of the Christian faith, has unequivocally pronounced the passage to be an interpolation. Gibbon asserts that it was introduced into the text of Josephus between the time of Origen and that of Eusebius, while Dr. Kippis boldly declares that it ought "to be forever discarded from any place among the evidences of Christianity." Tanaquil Faber suspects that the author of the forgery was Eusebius; and there can be no doubt, judging from the character of the man, that this opinion is correct. To adduce evidence in support of the assertion that Josephus never wrote the passage attributed to him would be hardly necessary when so many Christian theologians, bishops, and university professors pronounce it a forgery, and prove it to be such by the most reasonable and convincing arguments.

The passage is as here: "3. Now, there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works; a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ; and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross,[1] those that loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day,[2] as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day."

The contents of this famous paragraph condemn it as a very clumsy, if not stupid, invention. Madame Blavatsky says (Isis Unveiled, vol. ii, p. 328): "This paragraph (of sixteen lines in the original) has two unequivocal assertions and one

[1] A. D. 35, April 5, [2] April 5.

qualification. The latter is expressed in the following sentence: 'If at least it is right to call him a man.' The unequivocal assertions are contained in 'This is the anointed,' and in that Jesus 'appeared to them on the third day alive.'"

History shows us Josephus as a thorough, uncompromising, stiff-necked, orthodox Jew, though he wrote for "the pagans." It is well to observe the false position in which these sentences would have placed a true born Jew, if they had really emanated from him. Their Messiah was then and is still expected. The "Messiah" is "The Anointed," and *vice versa*. And Josephus is made to admit that the first men among them have accused and crucified their Messiah and Anointed. No need to comment any further upon such a preposterous incongruity.

Surely Eusebius has immortalized himself in the controversies which he so craftily instituted, knowing how greedy for notoriety men are who make a life study among the dogmas of the Church. He lived in an age of controversy, and took sides with heartiness because he believed what he advocated. His conscience being of an accommodating quality, he was able to turn his pen to any and all kinds of work, good, bad, and indifferent, for the sake of carrying his point in an argument. He was an apt follower of the learned rascal who is called Tertullian (born about A. D. 160, at Carthage), and whose powerful intellect, ardent temper, austere manner, and great erudition gained him the character of "untrustworthy, *outré*, insolent, ferocious, without charity, and the most intolerant of his century." It is generally believed that Eusebius is responsible in a great degree for what we know of Tertullian; and that if Eusebius wished to create a churchman, the character given to Tertullian would be the very one he would most desire. For humanity's sake it is better to suppose that nine tenths of Tertullian is mythical, having existed only in the fertile brain of Eusebius. "It is as fortunate for us as it is unfortunate for the Roman Church that such clever sleight-of-hand as that resorted to by Eusebius is rather difficult in our century. It was easier to

pervert chronology 'for the sake of making synchronisms' in the days of the bishop of Cæsarea than it is now; and while history exists, no one can help people knowing that Plato lived six hundred years before Irenæus took it into his head to establish a new doctrine from the ruins of Plato's older Academy" (Isis Unveiled, vol. i, p. 288). Saintly Father of the Church, indeed! There have been too many such whose services have been accepted by the Church, probably on the plea that any and all means are justifiable when used in the service of Christ. The inconsistency of this position is recognized in our day by both churchmen and their opponents, but the churchmen have not yet purged their history of its fraud, deception, and falsified records.

A short analysis of the contents and character of the works of Eusebius may be useful to the student of Church history. The materials for the study of this author are not very convenient. The Chronicon is in fifteen books, six of which are devoted to exposing the follies of the heathen systems of theology and worship, while the other nine are occupied by arguments supporting the superior claims of Christianity as a rule of life. It seems strange to us, who enjoy a broader light on the condition of the age in which Eusebius lived, that his assumptions could have gained any acceptance from cultured men in the face of the fact that the new religious faith included so much of the old under a new name. How the wise ones of that day must have smiled when they recognized their familiar gods and goddesses under the new names and titles conferred upon them in the Christian Church.

The several books of the Chronicon may be epitomized briefly as here:

1. Eusebius opens with a carefully prepared answer to some objections to the new faith from both heathen and Jewish writers, and soon turns his attention to the inestimable blessings that Christianity has already conferred on mankind. His work is valuable for the many details he gives of the different heathen systems. He says the Greek worship of the heavenly bodies is the oldest form of idolatry. In this he

shows how little he was learned in the history of comparative mythology. We now know that the claims of Christianity to having supplied new objects of faith and worship cannot be sustained in the face of what is taught by the various systems called pagan or heathen.

This book contains that famous passage from the ancient Phœnician author, Sanchoniathon. There are serious doubts on the question as to the fact of the existence of this author outside of Eusebius. The spurious "Translation of Sanchoniathon into Greek by Philo Byblius" does not help to clear up the doubt. Whatever Eusebius touches is defiled and made of less worth. If Sanchoniathon was a real personage, it is his misfortune that so pious a bishop as this author had any need of his writings, for they have been colored by the general tone of untrustworthiness that characterizes all his writings.

2. In the second book the religious system of Egypt, as given by Manetho, is treated. There are allusions also to Diodorus Siculus, Eumenes, and Clement of Alexandria, and he devotes some space to an exposition of defects in the philosophical system of Plato.

3. This is occupied by an essay on the folly of the Greek method of explaining in allegories their mythology fables.

4 and 5. Exposing the vanity of heathen oracles and divination generally, showing that pagan worship is addressed to demons, and that it was the special mission of Christ to deliver mankind from those very demons.

6. The doctrine of fate is refuted, as also the supposed influence of the stars on human affairs, and the doctrine of the freedom of the will is set forth.

7. The Jewish system is commended for its excellencies. He gives a good account of the Jewish conceptions of God, angels, demons, spirits, men, and creation.

8. The sources of the Jewish religion are treated, and the Septuagint described after Aristeas, with the Mosaic theology and religion. In this book we find his notions on the double sense of the text of the Old Testament. He extols the piety of the Essenes and the wisdom of Philo (Judæus ?).

9. He claims that the best Greek writers referred to and quoted the Hebrew Scriptures, which may have been true in his day, but was not true in any age before Alexander's time, 330 B. C.

In books 10, 11, 12, and 13 he shows how the Greeks had borrowed all the good things they ever had in their philosophy from the Jews. This charge seems very ridiculous to us in view of what we know of the life and thought of many Greek poets, philosophers, and historians. We could as soon admit the claim of a literary man of the present day if he should say that Shakspere and Ben Jonson had stolen his best thoughts. In one sense they have—in being first in the field of literature, as the Greeks were. In this way the Greeks and other ancient nations robbed the Jews of their sublimest thoughts by having published them ages before there were any Jews in existence. Clement of Alexandria is mentioned in this connection.

In books 14 and 15 he exhibits the inconsistencies of heathen philosophy.

The work, as a whole, shows extensive and careful reading, and it is therefore valuable for what it preserves concerning the knowledge, philosophy, and superstition of that age, besides its so-called fragments of lost books.

In his sequel to the Chronicon, which was called "A Demonstration of the Truth of the Gospel," or, rather, a proof of the claims of the Church, the intention is to convince the Jews that Christ is come in fulfillment of their ancient prophecies:

In book 1 he argues that Christianity is a realization of the ideas of the ancient Hebrew patriarchs, and also extols the virtues of abstinence from marriage.

In 2 he shows how prophecy foretold that Christ was to come for all men, first to the Jew and then to the Gentile.

In 3 he shows how Christ is the true Savior. He compares Moses and Christ, defending Christ from the charge of imposture, and advocates the genuineness of the miracles.

In 4 he argues that Christ is the incarnated deity, and that angels have an important ministry to perform in the world.

In 5 he shows how every act of Christ's life was predicted by the Jewish prophets. He then compares the Jewish prophets with the heathen oracles, and proves the divinity of Christ by reference to John's gospel (i, 1) and Colossians (i. 15, 16).

In 6 he continues the argument from ancient prophecy: and in 7 and 8 also, showing how the manner and place of his birth, family, and other particulars were foretold. The truth is that the gospels having omitted these important particulars, Eusebius kindly undertook to supply the want.

In books 9 and 10 he quotes certain passages from the Hebrew prophets to show that particular events were foretold, such as the flight into Egypt, from Isaiah xix; the temptation, from the 91st Psalm; the first miracle, at Cana, from Isaiah ix; the walking on the sea, from Job ix, 8; the betrayal by Judas, from Psalms xl, 9; lv, 13; cix; and Zech. xi, 12; the darkening of the sun at the crucifixion, from Amos viii, 9; and his sufferings and death from Psalms xxii.

There is no comment needed on this work. The well-informed student of Church history and theology will be able to gather a few valuable suggestions as to his own course in life by reflecting upon this effort of the pious bishop and upon the present character which Eusebius bears among the greater number of sensible people.

It appears that Hierocles, a prefect of Bithynia and Alexandria, wrote two books against Christianity, about A. D., 300, entitled "Sincere Discourses to the Christians," in which he shows many of the contradictions of Scripture, and compares Christ with Apollonius of Tyana, a philosopher who lived about A. D. 50, in Cappadocia, and who was venerated by his cotemporaries for his wisdom, and was believed to have the gift of prophecy and the power of working miracles. He has been cited in modern times as a rival of Jesus Christ and the precursor of Swedenborg. To these books Eusebius wrote in reply his book "Against Hierocles, Governor of Bithynia." The work might have been valuable in some past age, but is useless now.

The Ecclesiastical History, or Church History, is in ten books, and is a valuable collection of materials concerning the early Church from its beginning, or, as it is said, from the year 1 of our era to the death of Sicinius, A. D. 324. The object of the work is to show the divine origin of the system of Christianity; its wonderful growth in the midst of the most bitter persecutions; the eminent piety and virtue of its teachers; the steadfastness of its martyrs and confessors, and the general glory of the new faith.

This veritable history incorporates the accounts of a certain religious sect of the East—variously known as Essenes, Therapeutæ, Ascetics, Monks, Ecclesiastics, or Eclectics in different countries, but in reality the same common brotherhood scattered about in different localities—and coolly adopts them as Christians. This was well enough for that time, three hundred years after Philo, for instance, who wrote about the sect in Egypt, but it will not answer for this age, when a more critical knowledge of antiquity enables us to separate truth from error.

The Essenes or Eclectics had a school at Alexandria in Egypt long before the date of the supposed crucifixion, and also at Ephesus in Asia Minor. From these schools missionary teachers were sent out into the surrounding countries, who established branch schools and colonies of the brethren wherever they were favorably received. Their writings were selected and condensed from all that was known of philosophy and religion in the world; and it is more than probable that what are now called the four gospels were compiled from those selected writings and edited to suit the local opinions of whatever church it was that required the work.

There is, perhaps, no better parallel to this method of making history than that practiced by certain secret societies of the present day. They adopt a name, say, for instance, The Independent Order of the Adamites. One of the founders, who may have sufficient audacity and some knowledge of ancient history from reading, perhaps without reflection, prepares a "history" of the "rite," which traces the Adamites back

to the brotherhoods of the Middle Ages, farther still, following faint indications of their good works during the Dark Ages, continuing on into the golden age of the Roman empire, and still more remote, finds hints of them among Egyptian and Assyrian remains, ending the inquiry, not in the ark, but at the creation of the first Adam, who, of course, is made the first Adamite. This "history" is adopted by the founders of the new order, who swear all new comers into a profound reverence for their "ancient landmarks," and promptly excommunicate all who dare to question for an instant the truth of the "sacred records."

So in this manner Eusebius became the "Father of Church history," for he in a great measure made both the Christian Church and its history, from materials which he found in the real history of the religious sects of the ages preceding his time, and inventing such parts as were useful in connecting the whole into the semblance of consistency. The key to this method of Eusebius is found in his treatment of Philo Judæus, whom he adopts as "one of us" (Christians). Considering that Philo, in the whole course of his many volumes, never once uses the word Christ, or Christian, or so much as refers to any of the gospels, or the apostles, or anything peculiarly Christian, this language of the devoted bishop is somewhat startling, except when viewed in the light just proposed, as a part of his scheme for making the history of the new sect.

In this work there is the oldest known list of the books of the New Testament as they were received in the canon of his day, say A. D. 324. Eusebius made the canon the subject of anxious inquiry, and he gives his own judgment, enforced by that of others who lived before his time, and his testimony forms a definite step in the history of the canon, exactly what it was reasonable to expect from his position; and from his time the books of the New Testament may be regarded as fixed and as embracing all the books now in it.

He also wrote a "History of the Martyrs in Palestine," in eight volumes, and a "History of the Life of Constantine," in

forty-five panegyrics on the emperor for his benefits to the Church and the Christian religion.

His "Harmony of the Four Gospels" was arranged in ten lists as here described: in the first were included all the passages in the four gospels that had the same reading; in the second, third, and fourth, those passages which were alike in three of them; in the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth, those which are found in two of the gospels; and in the tenth, passages that are peculiar to any one of the four gospels. This "Harmony" differs from what is called by that name now. It is a summary of the life of Christ, or an index to the four gospels, and it is not chronologically arranged, nor is there any attempt to reconcile apparent contradictions.

The oldest "Harmony of the Gospels" is credited to Tatian in the second century (b. 120, d. 170), which is lost. The next in order was that by Ammonius, and that is also lost, so the work of Eusebius remains the most ancient known on that subject, and it is dated A. D. 315.

One of his most useful works is the "Onomasticon," a topographical list of all places in Palestine. The work, as we have it, is the result of the successive labors of Eusebius and Jerome, and it is a record of the traditions that were current in their day. The names given in it are of great value to the historian and geographer, but the traditions attached to them are only curious, except that they have a certain value for comparison with the same or similar traditions which are found at the same places now.

Eusebius took a hint from the works of Origen as to the mystical sense of the Scriptures, which led him, as it did Origen, into a neglect of the historical facts. His "Expositions of Scripture" must, therefore, be considered as more curious than instructive.

He wrote fourteen minor treatises or sermons. Of these there are left only the Latin translations. He is also credited with a number of essays in controversies with Arius and Marcellus of Ancyra, who was the predecessor of Eusebius, a bishop or pope of Rome, according to the Church account.

These works, written in the Greek language, are a proof of the learning and ability of the man. The critic, by careful analysis of their contents, detects the character of the bishop of the Church. We must admire the man, but are inclined to detest the bishop. There is no real need of preaching Christ, and enforcing the lesson by the practice of fraud, lies, and other vicious conduct, as it appears from his works that Eusebius did on many occasions—so many, that it became the ruling custom of his life. In the matter of his testimony in favor of believing in miracles, we will not censure him, because we hold that in such cases the divine or the priest, as he was, must be consistent with his assumed position. Having assumed Jesus to be the Christ, and adopted the method of making history and inventing facts and perverting chronology for Christ's sake, he was only consistent in advocating the acceptance of the miracle, because it is only another kind of perversion of the laws of nature and truth. Eusebius gave himself to making unhistoric history and theology without precision.

It was the intention, in this sketch, to give some extracts from the writings of Eusebius that touch on the origin of Christianity, in which he unconsciously shows how the Christian system naturally grew out of and succeeded by displacing the Gnostics and other sects of the early centuries. If the student will read the sixteenth chapter of the second book of his "Ecclesiastical History" (Bohn's Library is the most convenient in English—it is to be had, also, in German), it will be possible to form an opinion from a consideration of the original materials. A few lines are all that a limited space will admit here, but they will be enough to show the character of the work and its author.

In describing the ascetics of Alexandria, he quotes from the writings of Philo Judæus (Philo the Jew), and says they were "wont to observe very many of the customs of the ancients, after a more Jewish fashion." He calls them healers (*therapeutæ*), for "they were a sort of physicians; delivering the souls of those who applied to them from evil passions,

they healed and restored them to virtue;" "the first of that sect took the name when the appellation of Christians had as yet been nowhere announced." He speaks of their renunciation of property: "they divest themselves of all revenues of their estates, and then, having laid aside all the anxieties of life, and leaving society, they make their residence in solitary wilds and gardens." "This race of men is to be found in all parts of the world; nor would it be fitting that either Barbary or Greece should not participate in so perfect a good; yet they abound in Egypt in each of the provinces called the "pasturages," and more especially in the neighborhood of Alexandria; and the best of men from all parts of the world betake themselves to the country of the Therapeutæ as to a colony." He mentions their churches as here: "In each parish there is a sacred edifice, which is called the temple, and a monastery, in which the monks perform the mysteries of the sublime life." "Those who were the first leaders of their sect have left them many records of the sense conveyed in allegories." He says they composed canticles and hymns to God, arranged in every measure, and in the most sublime sorts of metre.

Altogether, Eusebius describes Christianity as it appeared to him, which was, that the Therapeutæ were, in all respects, the same society that afterwards was known as Christians. This view is adopted by Gibbon in "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" (c. xv), and suggests that it was not they who embraced Christianity, but Christianity that embraced them.

It was the custom of Eusebius in editing the materials of real history, and in making history to suit the purposes of the Church, "to accommodate them to the faith of the orthodox."

Gibbon says that the progress of Christianity was, at first, slow, and confined within the limits of the single city of Alexandria, and so slow was the progress of this religion that, notwithstanding the rhetorical flourishes and exaggerations of the Fathers, "we are possessed of an authentic record which attests the state of religion in the first and most populous city

of the then known world. In Rome, about the middle of the third century, and after a peace of thirty-eight years, the clergy consisted of but one bishop, forty-six presbyters, fourteen deacons, forty-two acolytes, and fifty readers, exorcists, and porters." He estimates the number of Christians in Rome at 50,000 when the total population was 1,000,000, while in the whole Roman empire the proportion was only about one in twenty before the important conversion of Constantine. (See Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, c. xv.)

This was the very time covered by the history of Eusebius, and how different a picture it is from that presented by the bishop of Cæsarea. We know that the materials used by Eusebius for constructing his Christian Church were extant, but in the shape of records of the Therapeutæ, Gnostics, and other sects, religious and communistic or ascetic, and we are not sure that even Gibbon has not assumed or admitted too much in naming any as Christians when there is no positive evidence that the name was then used in the Church.

It is somewhat surprising to the student to find that the original writings of unlearned fishermen and shopkeepers should have been so ripe in the effects of already established institutions, bishops exercising spiritual and temporal authority as Peter did in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira, in the receipt of established revenues, and with a code of laws equal to almost every emergency. These things are usually the result of centuries of growth, experience, change, revolution, but in this case we are confronted at the first with a condition of things that suggests the miraculous. It is hardly possible to accept that view of the case without stultification. It is an abuse of the reason to offer any such ripe growth as the beginning. We are told by the Hindoos that their prophet, priest, and spiritual king, Gautama, was born possessed of all knowledge and power, mental and physical. But such miraculous births are infrequent in modern days, and belief in them as having occurred in the past has been weakened by the uniform experience of the whole human race that children

are born helpless and unlearned. The same is true of societies. They are the subjects of beginning in small numbers. helpless, inexperienced, and, however much they may inherit in material or spiritual wealth and tendencies, time only can develop the new order, the new life, and perfect the new Church that is built on the fragmentary relics of the old.

Eusebius assumes that the apostle St. Mark traveled into Egypt and founded the sect of the Therapeutæ in Alexandria. The modern Freemasons assume that King Solomon of Israel, King Hiram of Tyre, and Hiram the builder of the temple, were the original Grand Masters of their order. It is in vain that objectors ask how there could have been any need of Grand Masters when such a thing as a Grand Lodge was unknown. Grand Masters and Grand Lodges are a modern invention of European origin. The Freemasons of the Orient, whose traditions are independent of European influence, have no such officers. The reference to Solomon, whether a myth or not, and in the absence of any contemporaneous mention, cannot satisfy the critical student of history. The reference to St. Mark is equally unsatisfactory, and as pure an assumption. St. Mark is a pure myth, so far as a personality is meant. The so-called gospel according to Mark is a collection of the Therapeutical records and teachings, localized in some country—Egypt perhaps—and edited, amended, mutilated, by zealous partisans in various ages down to the time when the text was printed and so placed beyond further possible injury. The originals of all the gospel writings were in Greek, which was the language of the learned in that age of the world. The supposed Hebrew converts knew Greek only, unless we are to accept the story of a Hebrew version of some one of the four gospels, or of a different version which has been lost. The unlearned Hebrew fishermen could not have written their story in Greek. You could as soon believe that any one of our cab-drivers, or other unlearned laborers, could write in Spanish a history of the landing of Columbus as that the Jewish fishermen wrote the gospels in Greek. Both cases would savor of the miraculous.

The chief difficulty in the way of a correct understanding of this matter has been and is the desire of the priesthood to establish and maintain a divine and superhuman origin for the entire system of faith and teaching of the early Church; and it is, therefore, needful to cover up the historical fact that these mystical forms and ceremonies were in use in the mysteries of Eleusis and the churches of the Therapeutæ, in the worship of Mithras and the rites of the Gnostics and other pagan sects, and that not one of them was new or unknown. These facts are denied by the Church historians, or ignored, which is a practical denial. Modern scholarship and antiquarian research have given us the means of settling this case on its own merits. We now know that the Christian Church is no exception to the rule of a natural origin and a slow growth by the addition of one idea after another—the trial of new schemes that were accepted or rejected, according as the majority voted, at one council or another—until the sect having gained power by numbers, and popular favor by its wealth and learning and material display, find it desirable to have a background of history. This was supplied by such men as our good and pious bishop, Eusebius of Cæsarea, who adopted all the sects of the previous two or three centuries whose rites and ceremonies and teachings were of the right kind, and named the aggregate the Christian Church. We conclude that the historian Esebius was not truthful—he did not give the facts as he knew them, but as he wished to have them understood in the interest of the Church—and that the bishop Eusebius was not an example of a conscientious man; and that the man Eusebius was superstitious, crafty, a time-server, a partisan, a flatterer, and in no way a fit example for a young man who would retain his self-respect.

ATHANASIUS.

GREEK FATHER IN THE CHURCH, BISHOP, AND SAINT.

THERE are several characters bearing the name of Athanasius who are mentioned in Church history at different dates. The name is of Greek origin, and has been and still is very popular. There are grounds for a belief that the earliest of the name—who is said to have been a member of the famous Council of Nice and the author of the so-called Athanasian Creed—is a myth, which was invented as a historical background by the originators of that creed. It is now admitted among the Church writers that that creed was not the work of the earliest Athanasius, but was made in some later age. The truth probably is that it grew, as all theological inventions do, by the addition of one notion to another by different persons from year to year as occasions arose in the midst of the thousand and one controversies that have always kept the Church in a ferment.

The student will be glad to know what the Church says about the Athanasius of the third century, the famous bishop of Alexandria, Egypt, and opponent of Arius at the Council of Nice, where it is said the Nicene Creed was formulated A. D. 325, and settled the doctrine of the trinity and the time for holding the festival of Easter. Another account says it was the work, by compilation, of Vigilius Tapsensis, an African bishop in the fifth century. It was first commented on by the writer, Venatius Fortunatus, bishop of Poictiers, in the year 570. (See History of the Nicene Creed, by Dr. Waterland.)

A complete account of Athanasius would include an exhaustive outline of the controversy between the Arians

and the Athanasians, or in other words, the Unitarians and the Trinitarians. That question was never, and it never will be, nor can it be definitely settled except in the method proposed by the positive philosophy, which is to compare what can be known about the creative and sustaining principle, and accept such conclusions as we individually can comprehend, aided by the advice and assistance of those who have special gifts in the study of science, and peculiar ability in presenting their ideas.

It is unfortunate for humanity that the question has been kept open as it has. Many wars have taken place on account of it, and untold numbers have been sacrificed at the stake on both sides, but more especially on the part of the Trinitarians have the victims been demanded. Servetus was burnt at Geneva in 1553 by John Calvin, and Leggatt at Smithfield (now in London) in 1614 by the Bishop of London. While the difference of opinion ranges towards the extremes now as ever in the past, the custom of the age is to omit public exhibitions of the power that either party may have to oppress the other. Social ostracism, the private stab editorial, and numberless other mild and semi-civilized means, are still in common use among those who forget that in this country at least it is the theory of our popular government that each person has a right to private opinion on all religious questions without interference or disability of any kind before the law. But evil-disposed people can indulge in many ways of annoying one who differs in opinion without infringing such rights as are protected by the law.

The accepted "Father in the Eastern Church," Athanasius, was born about A. D. 296 at Alexandria in Egypt. He gave early evidences of remarkable talents, and was adopted as a pupil by Bishop Alexander, and trained for the Church. While he was yet a deacon, he went with his patron as a delegate to the famous council at Nice, where he earned immortal renown as the successful opponent of Arius.

His life seems to have been devoted to controversies on the person of the Savior and the doctrine of the Trinity.

He succeeded Alexander as bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 326, and then his real troubles began to appear. The Emperor Constantine was won over by the explanations of his creed by Arius, and he insisted that he should be reinstated in the Church. There was then less clear distinctions between the power of the State and that of the Church, and the emperors often engaged in ecclesiastical controversies. Athanasius refused to obey the wish of Constantine, and in an exposition of the position of Arius made a determined attack on Unitarianism. It is charged that the friends of Arius, in response to this attack, devised a counter attack, but directed against the private character of Athanasius. Arius had many sympathizers throughout Syria and the East generally, for at that time there was not such a uniform conclusion on the question of the trinity as has been since maintained by the power of the Church in spite of the opposition of those who could only receive the doctrine of the unity of God. It was, therefore, determined to summon Athanasius to defend himself before a council of Unitarians at Cæsarea for having murdered a bishop named Arsenius. Knowing the power over life and death assumed by these councils, under the favor of the emperor, Athanasius prudently declined to appear. Another council was convened at Tyre the next year, A. D. 335, which included both Arians and orthodox members, and this was attended by Athanasius. With the craft that the clergy knew so well how to use, instead of discussing his creed, they renewed the charges of murder and the violation of the seventh Commandment.

The appearance of the supposed murdered man in the council disposed of the first charge, and the woman in question pointed out another as her paramour when confronted by the bishop in the midst of a number of persons. But the majority of the council having determined on their action before the meeting, now deposed Athanasius as if he had been guilty, although as many as fifty bishops defended him.

Athanasius appealed to the emperor, and all parties were summoned before him, when his crafty enemies devised a new

charge, that he conspired to raise a disaffection in Alexandria which interfered with the export of corn to Constantinople. The emperor was prevailed upon to believe this accusation, and he banished Athanasius to Treves. The emperor died about two years later, when his son, Constantine II., restored the exiled bishop to his see, A. D. 337.

Again he was deposed by the Council of Antioch in 341, and succeeded by Gregory of Cappadocia. He then went to Rome, where he was cordially received and declared innocent in a council held A. D. 342, which decree was affirmed in the Council of Sardica A. D. 347, and two years later he was restored to his see by the emperor. When Constans, who had been his friend, died, he was again obliged to fly, and the Arians succeeded in having him condemned in two councils, at Arles and Milan, and his absence from Alexandria was continued until A. D. 362.

It was during this exile that he wrote the most of his works, and prepared for the council which he convened at Alexandria as soon as he was restored, at which the doctrine of the trinity was fully and clearly stated, for the first time in any council, as the faith of the Church, by authority.

But the controversy was not yet quieted. A new emperor, Julian, permitted his opponents once more to retire him from active service as bishop, but the rest was brief, for the successor to the empire, Jovian, recalled him to doxologies and duty, only to be interrupted by the order of Valens who favored the Arians. But the emperor, after becoming acquainted with the controversy, and finding that the people of his church at Alexandria favored their bishop's views, wisely concluded to permit him to enjoy his dignities in peace. So the remaining few years of his life were more peaceful, because it happened that the political kaleidoscope was not meddled with quite as much as usual about that time.

It is supposed that he died about A. D. 372, but there are no records fixing the date.

Athanasius is credited with having been the most remarkable of all the early Fathers of the Church, so far as earnest

contending for fundamental Christianity was concerned, and for the hostility he had to encounter from his opponents. His life was a continued series of trial, triumph, defeat, persecution. He was Bishop of Alexandria for forty-six years, twenty of which he passed away from that city while others enjoyed his place and dignities. He was a man of wonderful courage, firmness of purpose, and great prudence. His mind was clear and acute, and none ever knew better when to retire from an approaching storm, the violence of which he felt he was not prepared to endure. His far-seeing mind chose to avoid a present danger and bide its time until a favorable opportunity would offer itself in the natural course of events, which course he could in the meantime effectively direct.

He was consistent to his originally assumed position throughout life, for having once taken his ground on the faith in the trinity he never changed either in word or deed. His retreats were used for the means of preparation for new victories. At that time, men were beginning to debate the separation of Church and State, and he greatly strengthened the Church party.

Many bishops have proved themselves the enemies of their race, by their persistently striving to build up the power of the Church at the expense of the State, and Athanasius was no exception. He assisted in building up the authority of the Church by successfully opposing the authority of the emperor in all matters of faith. So far he was a benefactor of humanity, but not so in intention. No act of his during his long life can be credited to love of mankind as a brotherhood. He was, as it were, born in the cloth, reared in the Church, educated in orders, trained under the lead of a strong bishop, and experienced among the most fiery surroundings of determined men and tumultuous councils. In his day the Church divided into East and West, the Greek and the Roman; which schism has continued with unfriendly rancor to our day, and will for ages yet to come, or until the Church itself gives way before a new religion founded on a new philosophy, of which there are many signs of a not very distant coming.

His works did the chief service in forming the faith of the Church, in which state it continued with but little change throughout the Middle or the Dark Ages. How much his peculiar form of faith is directly responsible for the ignorance, vice, and crime of those religious but unfortunate days we have yet definitely to learn from such records as the guilty Church has carelessly or in spite of itself suffered to remain in existence. The revived paganism of the golden days of Greece and Rome is lighting our age towards a return to the walks of science and art and a general enlightenment of mankind, which was impossible under the domination of the Church, whose policy was to repress human reason, secular knowledge, liberty of thought, and all other things that might in any way interfere with the absolute sway of an infallible Church. A total separation of Church and State is the only safety of a free people, and this Athanasius did not practice nor advocate, for he as readily accepted the assistance of the emperor to regain his lost see as he opposed the same power when it touched one of his vested rights or privileges.

His works are comprehensive, and the student will find that they furnish the fundamental truths that underlie all the tenets that have any substantial value in the Church, whether Greek, Roman, or Protestant. They are to-day recognized as the most precious treatises ever produced for the maintenance of the faith.

His works were, a treatise on the Incarnation of the Word; Orations against the Arians, in five books; Discourse against the Greeks or Gentiles; a Disputation with Arius in the Council of Nice; Epistles to Serapio; an Apology to the Emperor Constantius, and an Apology for his own flight.

After studying the lives of the so-called early Fathers of the Church, it is almost impossible to accept them as real personages. There are many facts that are historical without doubt in their lives as given, but there is a large proportion of material that seems made for a purpose—for the purpose of acquiring power over the minds of men in the interest of the Church, and against the dearest interests of humanity. In

this light we can view the character offered us under the title of Athanasius, bishop and saint, as no other than an enemy of mankind, whose works are to be classed among the engines of evil, another instance of the prostitution of great talents in the cause of mental degradation and slavery.

CALLISTUS.

During the early ages of the Church the bishops of Rome gave little promise of that grand pontifical power which they afterwards attained. Nearly all that history has of them is a barren list of names. But lately a light has been thrown upon the lives and characters of several by the discovery of the writings of Hyppolytus. These serve to show that the early rulers of the Church were no more exempt from meanness and rascality than their successors of more modern times; and that they were mostly haughty, ignorant, avaricious, venal, corrupt, and disreputable men. Among these may be mentioned Callistus, or Callixtus, who is reckoned the seventeenth pope by Romanists. He was the son of Domitian, and was elevated to the holy see in 219, which he held for four years.

He appears to have been even more of a religious rascal than his predecessors. In early life he had been a slave in the family of Carpophorus, a wealthy Christian who was employed in the emperor's household. Having been established by his master as a banker in a business quarter of the city, he soon succeeded in securing the property of prudent Christians and the savings of widows and orphans. Callistus embezzled these funds, and being called to account, fled from Rome. He was seized, however, brought back to the city, condemned, and put to hard labor in the public work-house. At length his master obtained his release, and employed him in the collection of money due him. But the pious and defaulting banker was soon at his old dishonest tricks, and this time was condemned to be scourged and transported to the mines of Sardinia.

Having been again released through the influence of powerful friends, he returned to Rome, and became the favorite of the feeble Bishop Zephyrinus. Upon the death of the latter, Callistus became his successor in the episcopal chair.

These are about all the authentic facts concerning the career of Callistus which have escaped the most profound oblivion. Of course he has been eulogized by Catholic zealots, who make a business of burnishing up the blackest biographies for the credit of Mother Church. But the stubborn fact can no longer be disguised that this Callistus, a notorious thief and defaulter, snatched from the work-house and the mines, became the ruler of the Roman Church. The meagre chronicles of that time afford us not one favorable fact concerning him. He is, therefore, justly entitled to a prominent place on our muster-roll of infamous Champions.

THEODOSIUS.

THEODOSIUS, surnamed the Great, the last emperor of the whole Roman empire, was a native of Spain, and was born A. D. 346. He was the son of an able Roman general of the same name who, under the reign of Valentinian I., distinguished himself against the barbarians of Britain and Germany, and after quelling an insurrection in Africa in 373, fell into disgrace, and was beheaded at Carthage. The cause of his execution is not known. The younger Theodosius accompanied his father in his various campaigns, and at an early age acquired great proficiency in the art of war. Having saved Mœsia by a victory over the Sarmatians, he was made duke of that province. After the great defeat of the Romans, and the death of the emperor Valens at the battle of Adrianople in 378, he was called by the succeeding emperor, Gratian, from his retreat in Spain to assume the government of the East, and to take the conduct of the Gothic war. After arriving at court, he was invested with the title of Augustus, and associated with Gratian in the administration of the empire, particularly of those provinces which Valentinian had possessed in the East. He defeated the Goths in several severe actions, and compelled them to sue for peace. His fame spread into Persia, and Sapor III. solicited his alliance. The revolt of Maximus and the murder of Gratian soon followed, and the former was recognized as emperor of the West by Theodosius. But subsequently taking up arms in the cause of Valentinian, he defeated Maximus near Aquileia, and had him put to death in 388. After spending the winter of that year at Milan, and receiving the honors of a triumphal entry into Rome, he returned to Constantinople and defeated the

barbarians who had ravaged Macedonia and Thrace. He reigned at Constantinople, and Valentinian was emperor of Rome until his death in 392. Having been received into the Christian Church, he distinguished himself against the Arians. He was a zealous Catholic, and theological conflicts and persecutions form a prominent part of the history of his reign. In 390 insurrections broke out at Antioch and Thessalonica, which were finally subdued with frightful vengeance by His Christian Majesty. Loving money to distraction, he had levied a very heavy tax upon those cities, then the finest of Asia Minor. The people of Antioch, in despair, having demanded a slight diminution, and not being able to obtain it, went so far as to break with the emperor's father,—the Spanish soldier. Chrysostom, the golden-mouthed saint, a priest and flatterer of Theodosius, incensed the emperor against the city for this action, which he made out to be a sacrilege, since Theodosius was the image of God, and his father was nearly as sacred as himself. The Christian emperor, not recognizing the Antiochians as images of God, despatched orders to the governor to apply the torture to all who had been engaged in the sacrilegious sedition—to make them perish under blows received from leaden balls attached to cords; to burn some, and deliver others up to the sword. It may be believed that the governor was likewise a Christian, from the punctuality with which he executed his cruel commission; for it is related that the river Orontes bore nothing but corpses to the sea for several days. Then the gracious emperor granted pardon to the city and doubled the tax. This pious prince avenged the sedition at Thessalonica by inviting the people to a circus and then slaughtering fifteen thousand of his disaffected subjects. For this frightful and perfidious massacre, Ambrose, the famous archbishop of Milan, solemnly rebuked him, and imposed upon him the tedious penance of absence from Church for eight months. But even this great act of expiation and piety, this non-attendance at mass, did not restore to life fifteen thousand innocent individuals treacherously slain in cold blood. Such a crime would have stained the charac

ter of a pagan emperor, like the virtuous Marcus Aurelius, or an apostate, like Julian. As illustrating the different courses of conduct pursued by a Christian emperor and the great apostate himself, we adduce the fact that when the great and philosophical Julian was personally the subject of the most insulting and injurious outrage in the same city, he merely answered the people by a light and ingenious satire. When they composed against him the most violent satire, he contented himself by displaying more wit than they. And he was the man that has been denounced by historians, and in thousands of pulpits and college declamations, as an apostate, and Infidel, and a wretch. No, Julian was not a Christian, and no Christian act ever disgraced his career. No heretic ever enticed fifteen thousand people for the purpose of massacring them because, forsooth, some of them had defaced the paltry statue of his father.

After the assassination of Valentinian, and the defeat of Eugenius, who had usurped the throne after his death, Theodosius became the sole master of the great Roman world. While he was preparing changes in the administration of his extensive dominions his health gave way, and in January, 395, he died at Milan, aged fifty years. He had reigned over Rome sixteen years. Before his death he divided his dominions between his two sons Areadius and Honorius, to the former of whom he gave the Eastern empire, and to the latter the Western. His grandson, Theodosius II., who sueeeeded his father Arcadius in the East, was the emperor who commanded the formation of the celebrated code of laws known as the "Theodosian Code." Notwithstanding the many acts of cruelty which mark his reign, the character of Theodosius has been generally eulogized by Christian historians. But analyzed in the certain light of authentic and impartial history, his courage and his generalship constitute his sole redeeming qualities. His persecution of the Arians have made his reign forever infamous in the annals of Rome. He also has the unenviable credit of extirpating paganism by force of arms in all the provinces of Rome. He reëstablished

Christianity, and gave it control over the civil power. During his reign, bishops and Fathers of the Church marched at the head of numerous bands of their new proselytes, destroying the idols and leveling the temples of the ancient religion to the ground. Twenty-eight years after his death there was not a vestige of paganism discernible in all the empire of Rome. Christian cruelty and intolerance had triumphed: and from that day Rome began to totter to her fall. Fear and force and fraud marked the establishment of the Christian faith; and bigotry, bloodshed, and persecution have perpetuated it through the dark, long ages. It is indebted to royal robbers and the most murderous monsters that have ever cursed mankind for its existence and preservation; and chief among these is Theodosius, the Christian Champion and red-handed butcher of the people of Thessalonica.

ST. CYRIL

A MILLENNIUM and a half ago, Alexandria was the intellectual and commercial centre of civilization. In the multitudinous life that poured through its two great, wide streets commingled representatives from all the nationalities of earth. At that time it vied with Constantinople itself. Its lofty temples and theatres, gymnasiums and synagogues, and its marvelous porticoes and palaces, rose in unrivaled magnificence on every side, and were the pride and glory of the East. Its harbor was a forest of masts. Countless boats brought in the abundant harvests of the Nile to feed the many-mouthed multitude, and long trains of camels from the yellow sand hills of the desert wound through the thriving streets of trade. It was the favored seat of science and learning to which flocked philosophers from all parts of the world. Botanical gardens, zoological menageries, chemical laboratories, and anatomical and astronomical schools, afforded all that was needed for scientific pursuits. Its university contained fourteen thousand students, and its two splendid libraries over seven hundred thousand volumes. But Christianity, with its baleful accompaniment of ignorance and superstition, intolerance and bigotry and bloodshed, had here entered upon its cursed career, seeking to suppress all that was lovely and valuable in the antiquity of thought, and to inaugurate a fit prelude to the Dark Ages which followed erelong. Christianity, with its brutal club, here met and shivered the polished steel of Grecian philosophy, and extinguished the last remaining spark of classic art and intellect. In the Serapion was a magnificent library of four hundred thousand volumes, and the astronomical and geometrical

instruments which had once been assiduously employed by Euclid, Eratosthenes, and others, but which were now regarded by Christian ignorance and bigotry as devices of the devil. In digging the foundation for a new church, to be built upon the site of an ancient temple of Osiris, some symbols of phallic worship were discovered. These were exhibited for the derision of the rabble in the market place, and a riot ensued. The pagans made the Serapion their headquarters. Theophilus, formerly a monk of Nitria, a bad, bold man, was at this time archbishop of Alexandria. He, armed with a rescript from the emperor, ordered the destruction of the building. The library was destroyed, the treasures of the temple were pillaged, the image of Serapis was broken to atoms by battle-axes, the whole structure was razed to the ground, and a Christian church constructed in its precincts. The other temples forthwith shared the same fate; the brutal, black-cowled monks now began to tyrannize over the ancient faith and philosophy, and convulse Alexandria with Christian riot and conflict. Finally Archbishop Theophilus went the way of all flesh, and his nephew, the subject of this sketch, succeeded him.

This cruel, fanatical Father of the Church was born in 376. He was called to occupy his uncle's throne in 412. From all that can be learned of him, he appears to have been a testy, turbulent, headstrong prelate, who quarreled with everybody and everything. He had been expressly prepared for his holy office by a residence of five years among the monks of Nitria. There were at this time within the walls of Alexandria not less than forty thousand Jews. St. Cyril signalized his unscrupulous zeal by sacking the synagogues, pillaging the houses of the Jews, and finally, at the head of his old associates, the Nitrian monks, who had swarmed into the town from the desert, succeeded in driving them from the city. Orestes, the governor, while endeavoring to stop the riot, was assaulted, and wounded in the head by a stone thrown by one of the monks.

The Alexandrine school was celebrated for its mathemati-

cians. It had produced some of the most remarkable men in the history of science. Here Euclid taught, and wrote that immortal work on geometry which still bears his name, and which has extorted admiration from all posterity as the model of correct and perspicuous exposition. Here had the great Archimedes made his mechanical discoveries and inventions, and conveyed his magnificent sense of mastery and trust in the universality of natural law in the well-known saying, "Give me whereon to stand and I will move the world."

Here Eratosthenes demonstrated the rotundity of the earth, Apollonius invented the first clock, Hero the first steam engine, and here flourished Hippocrates, the father of medicine. Here also lived in the time of Cyril, Theon the Younger, the famous mathematician and Platonic philosopher. He wrote commentaries on the Almagest of Ptolemy, and edited the works of Euclid. The beautiful and gifted Hypatia was Theon's daughter. She had become celebrated all through the East by her expositions of the Neo-Platonic and Peripatetic doctrines of philosophy in the academy at Alexandria. The wealth and fashion of the emporium of the oriental world crowded her lecture room, and long trains of chariots daily stood before her door. She was honored for her virtue and grace and talents, and her aristocratic audiences rivaled those of Cyril, the archbishop. She was considered by Christians as a Pagan sorceress. At last it could be no longer borne that the learned and lovely enchantress should divide the great metropolis with the powerful prelate. In the sweet person of Hypatia seemed typified the witchery and magic of classic Greece, her art, her poetry, her philosophy. Cyril was the personal embodiment of ecclesiastical ambition and intolerance. These two now stood face to face in the city of Alexandria—the former armed with the bright sword-blade of reason; the latter, with the iron mace of brutal power. The finely-tempered Grecian steel is shivered by one swift, tremendous blow.

And now occurs one of the most tragic scenes that blacken

the long, bloody catalogue of Christian crime. One day in 414 Hypatia went forth to her academy. She is met by Cyril's mob—a merciless mob of many monks. These brutal, bare-legged, black-cowled fiends drag her from her chariot and strip her naked in the public street. They drag her into a Christian church, and in that sacred edifice she is killed by the cruel club of Peter the Reader. The murderous monks then outrage the naked corpse, dismember it, scrape the flesh from the bones with oyster shells, and cast the remnants into the fire. A Christain saint has glutted his vengeance. He has removed the great obstacle in his way to uncontrolled power in the city. With his clumsy club of bigotry he has given science a deadly blow, and it must now sink into obscurity. And it did; it finally expired in the intellectual metropolis of the world. It henceforth, through the long, dark Christian ages, lay dead and prostrate at the feet of the Church.

Thus perished in her fresh, fair youth the loveliest and most intellectual lady that ever fell a victim to religious riot and persecution. Her crime was having taught Homer and Plato, and expounded the teachings of Apollonius and Aristotle in the academy of Alexandria. For this a Christian saint incensed the populace against her, and her naked and bleeding body was dragged into a Christian church to be outraged and burnt. Though this crime of Cyril passed unquestioned; though in his privacy he might laugh at the tragic end of his charming antagonist; his memory will have to bear the weight of the righteous execration of mankind through all the after ages.

This saint and Champion of the Church died in 444.

SIRICUS.

THIS bishop is counted the fortieth pope, according to the Catholic catalogue. He was chosen to the Roman see, after considerable opposition, in 384, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Damasus. He was a native of Rome, the son of a citizen named Tiberius. The chief opponent to his elevation to the ecclesiastical dignity was Ursin, the old schismatic. It is mainly as the principal propagator of clerical celibacy in the fourth century that his life and actions are of historical importance.

Priestly purity is an ancient ascetic absurdity, founded on the delusion that all natural propensities are evils, and that human perfection can only be attained by a total extinction of all sense of pleasure, thought, or action. It is an old Brahminical notion, long ago pulverized by the abrasion of the ages. The pagans regarded virginal purity with great veneration. The hierophants, among the ancient Athenians, had the habit of drinking hemlock for the purpose of destroying their virility, and none but the impotent were considered eligible to the pontificate. The priests of Egypt abjured all commerce with women from the time they attached themselves to the service of the divinities. They forswore the use of flesh and wine in order to better fulfill their vows by quenching the flames of sexual desire. The ministers of Cybele were all eunuchs.

Wishing to imitate the pagans in this particular, Siricus applied to the Christian clergy the words of Paul: "Those who are in the flesh cannot please God." Toward the close of the fourth century he issued his famous decree, strictly enjoining celibacy on the clergy. This mandate was approved

by most of the synods in the West; but the fact that it was generally disregarded in the East goes to show that at this time the bishop of Rome was not venerated as the head of the universal Church.

The subject of celibacy had been considered by the Council of Nice, and left undecided. Siricus was an imperious and ambitious man, and so soon as settled in the holy seat, he resolved to test his pontifical power. This he did by excluding from the clerical ranks all who preserved their marital relations. He clearly saw that the isolation of the priests from the ties of family and society would be the most effective measure for rendering them subservient to sacerdotal authority. Accordingly, he determined to enforce celibacy by pontifical decree. Though his mandate was generally obeyed at Rome and throughout Italy, yet large numbers of the German, Spanish, English, and the Eastern clergy continued, for several centuries longer, to avail themselves of the natural right left them by the undecided action of the Council of Nice.

There remains nothing further of especial consequence to be mentioned in the personal history of this bishop. He died 398. But the prohibition of priestly marriage, first fulminated by him, was repeated from time to time by his successors and enforced in a more vigorous manner, until, in the eleventh century, the great Gregory made celibacy of universal obligation. Mother Church commenced its intolerant crusade against matrimony. Married priests were reduced to infamy and want, or were obliged to renounce their unholy connection. In Germany there were many places in which no ministers were left to perform the services of the Church.

The following will serve as a sample of some of the atrocious anathemas enunciated by an arrogant Church against the marriage institution: "Whosoever shall say that the Church could not institute impediments annulling marriage, or that in instituting them she has erred, let him be accursed."

"Whosoever shall say that the marriage state is preferable to a state of virginity, or celibacy, or that it is not more

blessed to remain in a state of virginity or celibacy, than to be joined in matrimony, let him be accursed."

"Whosoever shall affirm that matrimonial causes do not belong to the ecclesiastical judges, let him be accursed" (Canon of the Council of Trent).

It is thus that this religious monster, the Catholic Church—a Church which, for ages, has feasted upon the blood and tears of innocence; a Church whose heart is festered to the core with corruption and lust, hypocrisy and murder; whose priesthood is the most licentious, unprincipled, and polluted body of men that ever cursed the race or disgraced the name of religion; a Church whose history is a damnable record of crime, dissoluteness, and duplicity; whose *holy* orders are a compound of fraud and avarice, seduction and adultery; whose nunneries and charitable institutions have been dens of infamy—it is thus that such a Church has anathematized the holiest relation that blesses humanity, that has sought to extinguish, in the name of God and his mother and all the saints and angels, every feeling of conjugal, filial, and parental affection, and to sever the ties that bind the interests of society together. Ay, this old Mother of Harlots has had the devilish audacity to prate of purity even while contaminating virtue and beauty with her breath of pollution, and alluring them to her massive and magnificent brothels. Ay, a Church that asserts and defends the practice of concubinage, while warring upon marriage! Read her record. The Council of Toledo forbade priests to keep more than *one* concubine in public. William Hogan declares that every priest keeps a concubine, and every teacher in a school attached to a nunnery has been seduced by her teacher. Chamancis asserts that "the adultery, obscenity, and impiety of the priests are beyond description." Cardinal Campeggio asserts that "the priest who marries commits a more grievous sin than if he kept many concubines." Pope Paul protected houses of ill-fame. Pope John XXIII. was convicted of having committed seventy different sorts of crimes, among the number of which was illicit intercourse with three hun-

dred nuns. Read the accounts of the Trappists, a monkish order constantly employed in abducting females for the purpose of sacerdotal rape. King Edgar, at the Council of Canterbury, declared that the houses of the clergy were nothing but brothels. Cardinals and popes lived openly with courtesans. Rome was the spot where sodomy and incest and every sort of licentiousness met and overflowed. And these are the men, and this the Church, that have talked so long and loudly about chastity and celibacy; that have waged such an unremitting warfare against the amiable virtues of conjugal union and domestic life, and have cursed that sacred altar where Love, the priestess, lavishes her choicest gifts; that altar which is the base of woman's hope and man's happiness, and which is the sole foundation of social purity, refinement, and civilization.

DIOSCORUS.

During the fifth century, the Nestorian controversy convulsed all the capitals of the East with Christian conflict. The question at issue involved the divinity of Jesus Christ: whether he was more God than man, and whether the God part of his nature could be separated from the main part. In 427 Nestorius occupied the see of Constantinople. There, in the great metropolitan church, he preached, with all the eloquence of which language is capable, the attributes of the illimitable, the everlasting, the Almighty God. He asked, "And can this God have a mother? Could a creature bear the uncreated?" He insisted that the son of Mary was human. The monks at once raised a riot in the city. Cyril, the orthodox archbishop of Alexandria, espoused their cause, and at once commenced the theological uproar that tore the Oriental world with tumult and faction. And the controversy was not confined to sermons, epistles, and pious proclamations. The saint of Alexandria instigated the monks of Constantinople to take up arms in behalf of "the mother of God." The patriarch of Constantinople excommunicated the archbishop of Alexandria, and the Roman emperor called a council at Ephesus to calm the holy hostility. Nestorius repaired to that council, supported by sixteen bishops and an army of the city populace. Thither went Cyril with fifty bishops and a rabble of sailors, bath-men, and prostitutes. The result was riot and bloodshed in the cathedral of St. John. The imperial troops were obliged to interfere to stop the Christian slaughter. The Virgin's party triumphed, Nestorius was deposed and exiled to an Egyptian oasis. His trinitarian adversaries solemnly asserted that his blasphemous

tongue was devoured by worms, and that from the heat of an Egyptian desert he escaped only into the hotter torments of hell.

During the Nestorian troubles, Eutyches, the archimandrite of a convent, distinguished himself as a leader. He was convicted by a synod held in Constantinople of denying the two natures of Christ, and of saying that if there be two natures there must be two sons. On his condemnation, Eutyches appealed to the emperor, who summoned another council. This was the celebrated "Robber Council" of Ephesus, which met in 449. Dioscorus was made president of the council. This fanatical prelate was chosen patriarch of Alexandria in 444, as successor to Cyril. At this time Flavianus was bishop of Constantinople. Dioscorus espoused the cause of Eutyches. These two rival churchmen came into open collision at Ephesus, and made the council notorious as one of bloodshed and robbery. Such was the violence which there prevailed that it has been stigmatized by historians as the "Bandit Synod," the "Robber Council," etc. The number of bishops assembled was one hundred and thirty. The question there submitted was whether Jesus Christ had two natures. The Egyptian monks and bishops declared that "all who would divide Christ ought themselves to be torn in two." The vindictive, fighting members immediately proceeded to settle the true nature of Christ by tearing each other in two. Like the Council of Cirtha in 335, and the one at Carthage, the "Robber Council" became a scene of battle between ferocious friars and exasperated, bloodthirsty bishops. Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, and one Barsumas, assaulted Flavianus, Bishop of Constantinople, and kicked him and beat him with their fists, amid cries of "Kill him! kill him!" with that violence that he died in three days.

After having thus put an end to his rival of Constantinople, Dioscorus next accomplished the overthrow of his rival of Antioch. He was sustained in his violent proceedings by an imperial edict and the determination of the

council. But the bishop of Rome refused to acknowledge him, and so the broil was continued between these two powerful prelates.

At last the emperor died, a council was called at Chalcedon, and Dioscorus was deposed from his episcopal dignity, and excluded from all Christian rites and privileges. He was exiled in 451 and died in 454. But Christendom continued to exhibit the most irreconcilable contests of rival prelates and placemen for sacerdotal supremacy, and a desperate scramble for the acknowledgment of their incomprehensible creeds by every unscrupulous resort to bribery, intrigue, and murder. The councils were generally ruled by men of the worst passions, and usually terminated in strife and bloodshed. Christian riot and outrage filled Antioch, Alexandria, Chalcedon, and Constantinople, and all the capitals of the East. Warring priests and brutal, butchering bishops drenched the civilized world with gore and filled it with anarchy, with pious poisonings, and plunder and pillage. One Christian sect caused the widows of another Christian party to be scourged and slain. Another caused the holy virgins to be stripped naked and flogged with the prickly branches of palm trees, and scorched over slow fires. The infuriated soldiery of rival councils, inspired by frantic hatred and the anathemas of contending churches, cut out the hearts of each other by thousands in the streets in the name of Jesus Christ. Toleration by a churchman has ever been held to be treason to Christ—to Christ, who came not to bring peace, but a sword; to set the hearts of families at variance with each other, and to curse mankind with woe and war.

ST. AUGUSTINE.

This distinguished churchman was sometimes called St. Austin by the Middle Age historians. He was one of the most celebrated Fathers of the Church, and one whose writings have colored the theology of his own and of succeeding ages more than the works of any or perhaps all other writers since his day. It is supposed that he was born November 13, A. D. 354, at Tagaste, an episcopal city of Numidia, in Africa. His parents were named Patricius and Monica, and were said to have been Christians of respectable rank. There must then have been different degrees of respectability, pagans, Christians, and perhaps several degrees of each. Of course our hero was of the nobility. The name of the father indicates that, for it is the Roman "patrician," a title of rank, varied a little to make it look like a real name.

His parents were careful of the education of their son. He inherited a strong and passionate nature from his father, and a spirited tone from his mother, who was a woman of superior power, full of patience and gentleness, and sustained by energy and perseverence, while her faith never faltered. In such cases it never does.

The son's studies were begun at Madura, where he remained until he was sixteen years old, when they were continued at Carthage.

His early exploits at school earned him the reputation of a wild, unmanageable scape-grace, given to many kinds of excesses which he bitterly repented, because of their effects on his health in later years. Having formed a connection with the sect called the Manicheans, he found ample field for indulging his inclination towards libertinism, for they were

constituted somewhat after the fashion in belief and practice of some of our modern societies of free-lovers. If the student feels inclined to read the story of this pattern saint and learn about the various forms of his temptation and indulgence, the book written by Augustine and titled "Confessions" will afford ample materials. The wild youth ripened into the saintly bishop, and his later writings contain many sad laments at the serious misdeeds of his early days; for when ambition fired his heart in the service of the Church, and he saw how with health and strength he could earn an immortality in the history of his race, he found himself bankrupt in life's treasures. Having wasted them in vice, they were no longer available in what he esteemed the cause of virtue. We regard this as a fortunate conclusion to what might otherwise have been a more effective means of oppression and corruption. But let us examine his life.

The age in which Augustine lived was the period when the Church was growing into power, the beginnings of which are traceable in the history of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, from A. D. 248 to 288. This movement was not that which became what is called Romanism some centuries later, but was distinct in itself, and developed holy places, holy persons, holy days; churches, priests, feasts, fasts, rites, and ceremonies, and the leaders, men like Cyprian and Augustine devised ways and means of compelling men through their hopes and fears to carry this load, and it has been carried from that day to this. There is a spirit of restlessness growing now-a-days that threatens to throw off a large part of this burden, the most prominent sign of which is the proposition to tax Church property. This increase in value of forms and ceremonies was a natural result of the heresies and schisms of the time, when the true spirit of humanity that prompted the original founders of the Christian system had been corrupted by selfishness, ambition, and love of ease, possible only in bad men. The good men of that age opposed these innovations, and were denounced as heretics, and they were treated to excommunication, banishment, and the stake. This is the true origin of what is called

persecution in the history of the Church. The persecutions have always risen in the Church itself, one party against another.

In the earliest accounts of the Christian system, we read of forms that were used as a means for promoting truth and order, but which very soon became the only apparent object, essence, and nature of the Church. In the beginning each church in the city or village was independent, and took care of its own affairs; but when such men as Augustine devised the scheme of priestly domination of one community over another, through the office of the bishop, then the synod and the council were assumed to have been of divine origin, and of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures. Then the apocryphal books of the gospels were used as proof of the assumptions of the bishops. Now the tradition of the Church has become so well grounded that those writing can be laid aside, even by the Church, and denounced as spurious. This is a little ungenerous towards writings that have done in their day great service. The same spirit prevails now in the revision of the New Testament, and some passages that have been of the utmost value in the past must suffer elimination.

Augustine was not a minister of the new Church but was a priest of the old Judaistic system, such as are all those who now admit the superior claims of the pope or bishop of Rome to authority in the Church. They are unconsciously perhaps priests of the ante-Christian, or the ancient pagan systems, whose idea was the theocracy, or the God as king system, represented by the bishop. The minister of the gospel is another person, and is as far the superior of the priest as the man is superior to the child.

Augustine had lived in ease and luxury in his early days, but he became a worker in the new field, and adopted a life of simplicity if not austerity. He had the examples of Tertullian and Cyprian before him, and he endeavored to outshine them both. He succeeded.

Tertullian was originally a lawyer, and introduced some of the ideas of that profession, as for instance, that of prescript-

ive right. When a person has been in possession of a certain property for a given number of years, and the property has not been claimed by another, it is acquired by prescription by the person who has occupied it. This principle Tertullian applied to doctrine in the Church, so that certain dogmas, after having been held for a number of years without opposition, the Church acquires a prescriptive right to hold them as of divine origin, and they can no longer be contested. This system was intended to cut off innovations in the Church, but it worked in the opposite way, because it was applied to error as well as to truth, and all that was necessary in any case was to inquire, what has been the general opinion on any point for thirty or fifty years past to determine its truth? Therefore an error fifty years old becomes a truth, as so many have done. The supremacy of the bishop having been established at Carthage by Cyprian, was strengthened by his successors, among whom was Augustine, and in due time became the divine right of the Church. Instead of the ministry remaining what it was originally intended to be, and had been in the early days of the Church, it was changed from a life of devotion to the cause of truth and enlightenment to a life of privilege, authority, divine right. Even then the supremacy of the bishop of Rome over other bishops was stoutly resisted. It was the general opinion throughout the churches then that the words, "Thou art Peter," applied to the man himself, and not to any system. It meant that the enlightened soul is the foundation of the true Church. Instead of this living truth, we have had and have now traditionalism and the hierarchy. The Church to-day is an army with leaders of different grades. There is also sacramentalism in the place of the personal communion in secret taught by the founder of the faith. Priestcraft was designed to bring about priest rule, and it did its work. All these errors led to popery and to spirtual debasement and slavery.

Augustine is said to have visited Rome and resided for a time in the house of a member of the sect of Manicheans, where he was ill for some time "of a grievous malady."

Soon after his recovery he was appointed lecturer in rhetoric at Milan, under the direction of Ambrose, who soon induced him to renounce adherence to his Manichean tenets, to abandon his immoral course, and to enter the true service of the Church. He was then thirty-two years of age, After two years of preparation, Ambrose baptized him, and he returned to Carthage. His mother died on this journey at Ostia.

His first literary work was directed against "The Morals of the Manicheans," which was followed by an essay on "The Soul." He retired to Tagaste, A. D. 388, where he wrote another book against the Manicheans, and a treatise on "True Religion."

He was chosen pastor of the church of Hippo (A. D. 391) in spite of the most strenuous opposition. He produced several minor works while in that office. In A. D. 395 he was elected colleague to Valerius, the bishop, and finished the well-known book on "Free Will." The controversial pamphlets against the Donatists were written between A. D. 400 and 415, those on the Pelagians from A. D. 412 to 428.

Augustine proved himself the priest by instinct and by training when he opposed Pelagius, who argued against priestly authority in matters of faith. His brilliant talents enabled him to influence the churches generally with his views, which were stated in language that was clear and definite. His works are, therefore, recognized as a precious heritage worthy of being preserved from loss or change. All the other priestly advocates of the churches, such as Jerome and Orosius, opposed Pelagius as the natural enemy of priest-craft. In his zeal, he sometimes went beyond the bounds of prudence, and was, therefore, constrained to publish a volume called "Retractions," in which he withdrew many statements and positions which he had before vehemently maintained.

His "City of God" was written about A. D. 426. This was his last work, for he died during the siege of the city of Hippo by the Vandals under Genseric, A. D. 430, being then about seventy-six years old.

His versatility appears in the various topics which he

treated. He wrote on music, metaphysics, history, science, and manners.

His influence, while it may be compared with that of Origen in the East, was more enduring and more general throughout the West, and it was not limited to his own time, but has been felt afresh at frequent intervals in the history of the Church.

His lack of the genuine spirit of humanity is seen in the development of Catholic dogma which appears in the writings of the schoolmen, and which proceeded from him. He was more original than Origen in invention, and surpassed him, also, in depth and acuteness. Every age has added its peculiar *animus* to the great and growing body called the Church, and Augustine represents the hierarchy of his time. He advocated a definite church system, at the expense of free thought and action among men, and his works shadowed various separate tendencies of theological development which were realized in after ages.

He was able to form, in a definite mould, the faith of the Church on the questions of original sin and grace, to which very little careful thought had been given before his own. His scientific mind, aided by a woful lack of conviction, or, rather, of conscience, enabled him to warp the thought of the Church for fifteen centuries. It is only recently, within the last fifty years, that scientific men have become interested in those topics, and began to undo the mischief wrought by Augustine, and are bringing us back to a proper sense of the existence of the unknown God and man's relation to the unknown.

He taught the doctrine of original purity in man, and a loss of that purity in the fall of Adam, whereby man became totally corrupted and depraved. Having passed through so many deep, soul-harrowing scenes himself, and succeeded, by craft, in securing the highest pinnacle of honor and profit in the gift of his fellow-men, it is no wonder that he looked over the vast multitude of unlettered men as over a herd of brutes, fit only for the ford, the slaves, the material out of which the

divinely appointed, but self-elected, bishop carves his fortunes. It seems, now, supremely insulting for such a man to write about divine grace. He may have had an intellectual conception of some such thing as a part of the great Church machine, but of the real spiritual element called grace, he could never have had the faintest glimmer.

His system may be sketched in a few words. God (he says) decreed from all eternity to create man holy, foreseeing, that if tempted, he would fall into sin, and which fall he permitted. Out of the fallen race of man, he chose to redeem a few by a redeemer, and to leave the others to suffer for their sins; the merits of the redeemer, applied to the saved souls, gives them a title to heaven, while those passed by are to be judged for their sins. He attached extreme importance to the right of baptism, holding that it was necessary to regeneration—teaching that the water had no virtue, but that Christ accompanied the act with his divine and invisible grace. The entire glory of the renewal of human nature is due to divine grace, and in no respect to human ability. This doctrine has been accepted almost universally by churchmen, Roman and Protestant, who have formed their creeds accordingly.

If the man who leads in any particular attack on humanity is deserving of more opprobrium than any of his followers, then Augustine should be the subject of the severest condemnation from all who have the interests of their fellow-men at heart. We are to-day contending with the evil spirit which he let loose among mankind. His work has shown the enemies of progress how to retard the spread of intelligence among men, how to enslave them, how to degrade them, and, in a word, how to so debase mankind, spiritually, as to make them resemble, to a great degree, the theoretical character of total depravity which the Church has imposed upon the race.

SIMEON STYLITES.

ASCETIC, FANATIC, AND SAINT.

THIS most worthy of all that great host of unwashed anchorite candidates for temporal immortality is said to have been born somewhere on the borders of the Syrian Desert, near the close of the fourth or in the beginning of the fifth century. With him was born a peculiar spirit of selfish asceticism that prompted him, at the early age of thirteen, to enter a monastery, where he at once became a pattern for the most devoted and a teacher of gray-beards in asceticism. How long he wasted his precious life there we are not informed. After several times narrowly escaping death from his austerities in the monastery, he retired to a cave in a mountain's side, and is said to have chained himself to a stone. Becoming restless and unsatisfied in that lonely place, he chose the more desolate location afforded by the top of a pillar in the midst of a populous city. There are several different accounts of the pillar occupied by Simeon. One says that the first pillar occupied by him was nine feet high, the second eighteen, the third thirty-three, the fourth fifty-four, and the fifth sixty feet. The tops of those columns were three feet square, and railed in about two feet high. Another explanation seems more consistent with other statements concerning his life. It is this: there was but one pillar occupied by the saint, and it was nine feet high when the holy man first took up his residence on it, and it increased in height from time to time in answer to his prayers to be elevated towards heaven, and this increase of height was from nine feet to sixty in all, when the saint, having risen near enough to paradise, floated off into the elysium of the sanctified.

Still another version of his life gives us a very queer account of a number of pillars, each one bearing a precious blossom of saintly excrescence. The reader is left to conjecture whether there was more than one saint on one pillar, and the other supposed duplications mere fictions of excited fancy.

The example set by Simeon became contagious, and, like an epidemic, suffering humanity, in search of a deathless notoriety and immortal fame, sought immediate distinction on solitary pillars, until so great was the number of them that the ruined temples and palaces of the ancients seemed to have blossomed out into a new and strange life.

The common sense of the people did not act in this matter before the twelfth century, when this method of reaching heaven was suppressed by law.

The revered and saintly figure of Simeon Stylites (Simeon of the pillar) was used as an amulet even in Rome and throughout the East, and it is probable that splenetics, henpecked husbands, hypochondriacs, and other suffering mortals carried his image about with them, cut on signet rings, on medals, or drawn on parchment by some holy recluse, the same having been sprinkled and blessed in the usual manner.

The example of Simeon has been sarcastically put in use by modern nations in the custom of placing the statue of some person, whom it is desired to honor for distinguished public services, on the top of a column in some public place, where it is exposed to the gaze of the people, who may, in such cases, safely vent their passions of veneration or hate, as the case may be, without resort to the stake or poison.

Another method of imitating the devotion of Stylites is that of some modern preachers who build themselves a wall around their ridiculously high pulpits, made of eccentricities, where they indulge in antics of a physical and mental character for their own glory and the amusement of the public. Of course, their immediate circle of admiring friends venerate their holy life and example, and carry their images about with them in card-cases, or other ways too familiar to need mention.

It is supposed that the central idea of these pillar saints of antiquity was that they secured a release from the bondage of sin, an emancipation from the slavery of evil, and attained the higher good by these austerities, and most peculiarly by the use of the pillars. The contemporary and succeeding writers described their condition by the use of every word that can mean beatitude as a positive happy state, and as an object of supreme desire. They said that the peculiar devotion on the pillar inspired the imagination, allured the affections, aroused the moral sense, and stimulated to an incessant watch over the passions. Of course, so long as the person remained chained on the top of a column fifty or sixty feet high there was little or no opportunity for indulging the passions, unless his appetite was the ready means.

Patience was the highest virtue, endurance was another element leading to positive exaltation and blessedness, in a contemplative life. In the perfect ascetic of the pillar the saint passes through several degrees of abstraction, so says a Greek writer of the age, which are in accord with the Gnosis of the Greeks; and which are, 1. The satisfaction of undisturbed processes of reasoning; 2. Passing on beyond the peace and joy of contemplation; 3. A gradual release from self-consciousness and definite memory, through indifference to them, into the infinite and illuminating power of the faculties, not yet separated from sensual enjoyment; and 4. A perfect fulfillment of all these energies with escape from all dependence on the senses.

The enthusiastic worshiper of the pillar-saint goes on to describe his elevation unto ecstatic contemplation, in succession through infinity of space, varied intelligencies, and so on until a dreamy state of conscious unconsciousness is reached, probably suggested by the Buddhist's doctrine of the "Nirvana."

These "retired" saints preached daily or hourly on great festival days to the admiring crowds that gathered about their pillars. They practiced a definite withdrawal from a sin-polluted and fallen world, and lifted themselves above temptation.

The totally depraved of mankind they utterly despised except when they wanted food or drink, or applause for their conduct or sermons. Clothing, we understand, was utterly ignored by them, as a mark of the fall in Adam, and the dominion of sin. It is said that our common mother Nature kindly supplied a hairy coat to many of them that made other covering unnecessary. In the climate of Syria all animals are provided with an abundance of hair, and men who go nearly naked are proportionally favored.

We are to learn from the pillar-saint an important lesson. He is not merely a piece of rubbish and an offense. The Church in that age held a grievous error as to the nature of faith. Instead of following the Pauline idea, that faith changed the entire nature of man, his understanding, heart, and will, by which the soul, freed from the bondage of sin by the salvation in and through Jesus the Christ, could perform new and acceptable works and feel new affections, the teachers of that age held that faith is the subjective appropriation of the objective work of Christ. This doctrine naturally overturned Christianity from its foundations, for it made faith a simple act of the understanding. The error spread throughout all the churches, and goodness without instead of within the heart, external actions, observances, penitential works, were the means of righteousness, and by which heaven was gained as by purchase for a price. The idea also prevailed that some men, as for instance, the pillar-saints, had advanced in holiness far beyond what was required for their own salvation. They were rich, therefore, in spiritual goods, and were solicited by the suffering sinners to bestow gifts of grace and mercy on them. The Church encouraged this notion, and it soon came to be accepted that salvation was not so much from God as from the priest and the saints. The belief that men could attain to a perfect state of sanctification and even go beyond was thus made use of as capital for the spiritual treasury of the Church, where the merits of saints and martyrs were stored up for the use of whoever could afford to apply for them. This was a real and practical sys-

tem of idolatry that displaced the worship of God and Christ. It has not as yet entirely disappeared from the visible Church militant.

The ecclesiastical ideal of life is ascetic self-repression and denial, complete abnegation; and not as if God made us for fulfillment, harmony, exaltation, and completeness of being and function, but as if we were made by the devil (as described by the Church), in opposition to the wisdom and wish of God.

Lower abnegation as a means for higher fruition, partial denial for the sake of total fulfillment, are clear and rational obligations. But the idea that ascetic self-sacrifice as an end pure and simple in itself is a virtue or a means of salvation is a morbid superstition with which the Church has always been diseased. This disease has produced some asceticism, fanatical ferosity, sentimental melancholy, dismal gloom, narrow mechanical formalism and cant, and a deep hypocrisy resulting from the reaction of excessive public strictness into secret indulgence.

Manners mold the character much more easily than opinions. Manners sink into society from the upper and more cultured classes; opinions rise from the very lowest grades up through the masses to the very topmost few. Opinions govern indirectly, while manners directly govern society. The ruling class tries to maintain things as they are by way of preserving their prerogatives, but the masses seek for new things, hoping by means of a change to better themselves.

The Church represents the vested interests of traditional authority, opposes the free thought which seeks for the true, and offers instead the unthinking drill of the established.

In order to put on a superior condition we must first put off self, and there is nothing nobler in the attributes of man than his ability to subdue the tyranny of old egotistic custom with new perception and impulse, and to start on a fresh moral career endlessly varied and progressive.

Instead of giving this principle a natural and universal application through its whole moral range of human life, the

Church dogmatist restricts it to a single supernatural application to the disciple of Christ, and would monopolize its influence to that one channel. Every bigot would drill the whole world in his own fixed mold, to his own pattern, stiff, harsh, ascetic, exclusive, instead of teaching how to exemplify in mankind the same generous liberty and variety which prevail in nature. Instead of directing attention to a miserable, repulsive saint, it should hold up all sorts of worthy ideals, that each may be admired and copied according to its fitness and beauty.

The world was believed to be, in those saint-making days, a sad and fearful place of probation, where redemption is to be fought for, while the violent and speedy end of the entire scene is implored. We see very little evidence outside of the writings of the pagan poets and philosophers that any one believed the world was a gift of beauty and a joy to be graciously perfected and perpetuated. The ideal of the Christian and the pagan contrast as midnight and sunlight, as the pillar-saint Simeon Stylites and Shakspere. In the one we have presented the crystallized superstition and authority of ages, in the other the culture, free, active thought, revealing the whole world of man in his heights and depths and breadths, exhibiting in turn every variety of ideal, and doing justice to them all. We sincerely hope that the time is near when such lessons as that given through the tutelage of the pillar-saints will no longer be endured by an enlightened people, The Church may be warned in time and afford better instruction. If the steward is found wanting in ability or in honesty, his office is taken away from him and given to another. The head steward will be found in the new Church built on the new philosophy of positivism.

CLOVIS.

CLOVIS THE GREAT was king of the Franks. More than a hundred authors have endeavored to find out the meaning of the word Frank. But it remains to this day a question upon which there is no certain knowledge. It has never been unquestionably ascertained what the name originally signified, any more than what was the meaning of Hun, Goth, Welsh, Picard, etc.

It is said the name implied a free possessor, while the others were slaves—that "I make you a Frank," was equivalent to saying, "I make you a free man." Hence comes the words franchise, and to enfranchise. Clovis was the founder of the French monarchy. The territory now composing France was anciently occupied by Celts or Gauls. After Clovis had made himself master of the country, and had united Gaul and Germany under one monarchy, all the people from the source of the Weser to the seas of Gaul bore the name of Franks. In the time of the Saxon emperors the name of France had prevailed as far as Constantinople, the court of which designated its sovereigns as Frank emperors. It is believed that the Franks came from the Trojans, and that their first habitation was beyond the Elbe, toward the Baltic Sea. It is certain that there were hordes of Franks living beyond the Rhine, who assembled under their respective captains or kings for the purpose of pillage. Constantine made an expedition against them, pursued them to their haunts, caused several of their chiefs to be hanged, and others to be thrown to wild beasts, for his amusement, in the amphitheatre of Treves.

Clovis was the son of Childric I. and Queen Bazine, the

wife of King Bazin. He was born in 467. He succeeded his father in 481. At that time the Frankish territory was confined within the sea and the Scheldt. In order to extend the limits of his kingdom, Clovis made war upon Syagrius, the Roman governor at Soissons. In 486 he captured him and put him to death, subjugated Paris, and the cities of Belgia Secunda. He compelled Alaric, king of the Visigoths, to surrender himself, and had him put to death. In order to obtain assistance in conquering the Allemanni, he espoused Clotilda, niece of Gundebald, king of the Burgundians. Clotilda was a devout Catholic, and had been educated by Catholic priests, in whose hands she became an instrument for the conversion of her royal husband. At first he resolutely resisted all her efforts to induce him to profess Christianity. When he first heard an account of the death of Christ, he exclaimed: "If I had been there at the head of my valiant Franks, I would have revenged him!" Clotilda persuaded him to have their first child baptized; but the babe soon after dying, he repented the concession he had made, saying to his wife: "If he had been consecrated in the name of my gods he would not have died; but being baptized in the name of your God, he could not live." But, undiscouraged by this unlucky event, she still availed herself of every occasion to induce him to relinquish the pagan worship.

Upon his setting out for battle one time, she said to him: "My lord, to insure victory, you must invoke the God of the Christians. He is the sole ruler of the universe, and he is styled the God of Armies. If you address yourself to him with confidence, nothing can resist you. Though your enemies were a hundred against one, you would be sure to triumph over them." In a battle with the Allemanni at Tolbiac, in 496, he came very near being defeated. His troops were flying in every direction, and the battle seemed lost. All at once the words of Clotilda came to him. He despairingly lifted his arms toward heaven, and loudly cried: "Oh, Christ, whom Clotilda invokes as Son of the Living

God, I implore thy assistance! I have called upon my gods, and I find they have no power! Deliver me from my enemies, and I will be baptized in thy name!" His troops were immediately rallied, and, fighting desperately, gained the victory. He observed his obligation, and was solemnly baptized at Rheims on the twenty-fifth of December, 496. In accordance with the queen's wish, the occasion was made one of unrivaled splendor. There were long trains of ecclesiastics carrying crosses, and pompous processions of priests and princes. He was baptized by St. Remigius, and was anointed with holy oil, which, the bishop affirmed, had been brought by the Holy Ghost, in the form of a white dove, from heaven for the occasion. Clovis' sister and three thousand of his court and army were baptized the same day.

Straightway upon his conversion, Clovis commenced to manifest his zeal in the cause of the Church. He imbibed the usual Christian spirit of hatred to hereties. "It grieves me," said he to a party of princes and warriors at Paris, "to see the Arians still possess the fairest portions of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God; and, having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their fertile provinces." His savage piety led him to declare that, had he been at the trial of Christ, he would have prevented his crucifixion. He summoned and dismissed a council of Gallic bishops; and then deliberately assassinated all the princes belonging to his family. After having removed, by violence or treachery, the princes of the different Frankish tribes, incorporated their government into his own, stained the soil with the blood of its proprietors and defenders, bowed in abject reverence before the clergy, and committed the most fiendish and heart-rending atrocities, the pope of Rome, in consideration of his piety and usefulness, bestowed upon him the title of "The Most Christian King and Eldest Son of the Church." While he did not hesitate to kill all who stood in the way of his ambition, he spared no pains to propitiate the Patriarch of Rome and secure the good will of the clergy. To insure the blessing of heaven upon his ambi-

tious undertakings, he made princely donations for pious purposes. In reply to a request of Clotilda that he build a church, he said, hurling his battle-axe from him with a strong arm, "Wherever it falls, there will I erect a church, and dedicate it to the holy apostles." He did so. Among other things, he made a present of his favorite war-horse to St. Martin's Church at Tours. Afterwards wishing to redeem the valuable animal, he offered one hundred pieces of gold; but the horse was retained in the stable by the miraculous power of the saint until he paid six hundred pieces. Gregory of Tours, a saint of the Church, after relating a most atrocious story of Clovis—the murder of a prince whom he had previously instigated to parricide—continues the sentence: "For God daily subdued his enemies to his hand, and increased his kingdom; because he walked before him in uprightness, and did what was pleasing in his eyes." The Christian Church has always commended crime when committed by those in its communion and for its advancement. At the battle of Vougle, in 507, he defeated Alaric II., king of the Visigoths, and killed him with his own hand. He thus added the whole south-west of Gaul to his dominions. He soon afterwards settled at Paris and made it the capital city. He died there in 511, after dividing his kingdom between his four sons. Clotilda survived her warlike and victorious husband; and after her death she was canonized by the Church. Her worldly ambition and the causing two of her grandsons to be stabbed in her old age, seem somewhat inconsistent with saintly character. Christianity is greatly indebted to women for its success. It was through Clotilda that Clovis and the Frankish nation was brought over to the faith of the cross; to Helena, the mother of Constantine, Bertha, queen of Kent, and Gisella, queen of Hungary, was the conversion of Europe largely due. It has been truly said that for the Christianization of every European country three conditions were necessary: a devout female at the court, a national calamity, and a monk. The people always followed their rulers, perfectly indifferent as to what the required faith

might be. After his conversion, Clovis became a devoted and, at times, a most savage champion of the Christian cause. But his baptism did not prevent his life being often blemished by crime and the most atrocious acts of violence. In fact, morality has never been a necessary accompaniment of religious faith. And it was by means of the sharp edge of the temporal sword rather than the sword of the spirit—by the swords of such successful soldiers as Constantine and Clovis and Charlemagne that Christianity was established in Europe. It is doubtful whether the Christian Church would have existed to this day had it not received its lease of power from the conquests of those three champions. And what influence did the gospel of Christ have upon the conduct of these men, its three most zealous and powerful propagators, alike in their character as Christians? It made them bigots and persecutors, but did not prevent them from being bloodthirsty and cruel, ferocious and immoral. It made them fanatics, but did not prevent them from being criminals and butchers. It made of Clovis a zealot and a hater of heresy, but did not hinder him from killing his kindred and soaking the soil of Gaul with the blood of its Arian proprietors. The legitimate influence of Christianity is illustrated on every blood-stained page of history. Its genuine spirit can be seen in the character of its most celebrated champions, cut-throats, and royal rascals like Clovis, who esteemed any villainy justifiable when committed in the name of Jesus Christ.

SIXTUS.

This character appears in the annals of the Church as the forty-sixth pope, and the third of the name. Convicted of incest, rape, and murder, the omission of a short sketch of him would leave an inexcusable void in this work. His advent to the holy see was in 412. He had previously merited the title of maintainer of the faith from the fanatical inveteracy with which he had pursued the unfortunate Pelazians during the pontificate of Zosimus.

Soon after his elevation to the pontifical seat, he was charged by Bassus, a priest of commendable character and illustrious birth, of having committed an incest, and of having introduced himself into a convent to violate a religious virgin named Chryssogonia. This atrocious accusation caused so great a scandal that Valentinian, Emperor of the West, was obliged to convoke a council, at which assembled fifty-six bishops, to examine into the conduct of the pope. The gold of the holy Fathers corrupted the judges, and the assembly declared that the crimes not having been established by material proof, the accuser should be condemned. By virtue of this judgment, the emperor and his mother, Placidia, proscribed Bassus and confiscated all his goods to the Church. But the virtuous priest who had had the presumption to present such charges against a person panoplied with pontifical power was not suffered to escape with such a slight sentence. Three months after bringing the accusation he died of poison. During his sickness he was served by Sixtus himself, who administered to him the sacrament, and after his death placed him in a shroud with his own hands in order to conceal the dead body disfigured by poison. There

is not a reasonable doubt that Sixtus himself was the poisoner. Of course, the most of Catholic chroniclers will contend that the pontiff came forth from this accusation pure as gold from the furnace; but in the certain light of authentic history this head of the Church stands convicted of the crimes of rape, incest, and murder. He died on the 28th of March, 420. We are told that during his life he gave to the Church more than two thousand six hundred and eleven pounds' weight of silver and gold, which he had extracted from the faithful by means of alms and testaments. And was it to be expected that the Church would pronounce a pontiff of such liberality guilty of the most atrocious crimes? There is no instance of the kind in the records of Rome.

VIRGILIUS.

The subject of this sketch is only distinguished by a life of perfidy, debauchery, and crime. Yet he has been placed by priests among the saints of the Church. He was a Roman by birth, and the son of a consul named John. He was a priest during the pontificate of Boniface II., and his unmeasured ambition prompted him to aspire to the honors of the episcopate. History shows him to have been capable of committing all crimes to elevate himself to power. "His character," writes a contemporary author, "was violent and passionate. In a burst of rage he killed with blows, with a club, a young child who refused his infamous caresses." His avarice was unbounded. He lived at a time when the bishopric of Rome had become a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud. At this period the episcopate was the only elective office at Rome. The Church had already entered upon its corruption. Priests and bishops distributed all their money, pledged their palaces, and sold the sacred vessels of the Church to secure the Roman see. The chair of St. Peter was adjudged the property of the last and highest bidder. In 530 John II. procured the pontifical tiara by paying enormous prices to his competitors.

Virgilius accompanied the pontiff Agapetus to Constantinople on his embassy to negotiate a truce between Theodatus and Belisarus, the great Greek captain of the East. While there he succeeded in so far securing the confidence of Theodora, the empress, as to receive assurances of her assistance in getting possession of the papal power provided he would reciprocate the service by reversing all the decrees of Agapetus, con-

demn the Council of Constantinople, then about closing, and execute such edicts of excommunication as she might mention. The ambitious Virgilius readily consented to obey the orders of the empress if he was elevated to the episcopate. She put into his hands seven hundred pieces of gold, upon his promise to restore the sum when he should become master of the treasures of the Church. The arrangement being satisfactorily concluded, instructions were given to the Greek general, Belisarius, to instate Virgilius as the successor of Agapetus.

Theodatus had already imposed a pontiff upon the Romans. But this obstacle did not check the ambitious young prelate in his projects. By exciting complaints against Silverus, the newly-chosen pontiff, Virgilius and Belisarius succeeded in having him deposed without recourse to violent measures. The Grecian general immediately called a council of the clergy to choose a successor to the vacant see. The votes for Virgilius were paid for in advance, and there was but little delay in his election and consecration, which took place in the year 536. The unfortunate Silverus had been accused of treason, and Virgilius took him into custody under pretence of preserving the tranquillity of the city. He was finally banished to Patera in Lycia. He was afterwards taken by the satellites of Virgilius to a desert island called Palmaria, where those were exiled whom it was desirable to put quietly and promptly out of the way. The holy Father sent executioners from Rome to dispatch his prisoner. The priests sent to execute his orders, after depriving their victim of food for nine days, became impatient that his death did not take place, strangled him and returned to Rome. The poor man's only offense was in having been chosen to the first see of the Church.

Virgilius had at last obtained undisputed possession of Peter's chair by a frightful complication of crimes and roguery. In order to confirm his authority he sent secret letters to each faction in his ecclesiastical jurisdiction, bribing them to clandestinely give him their support while openly

expressing sufficient dissatisfaction to allay the suspicion of rival parties. There is incontestable proof that he was an apostate to the Catholic faith, and the most consummate hypocrite that ever occupied the pontifical seat.

At length Virgilius was summoned by Justinian, the Emperor of the East, to appear at a council at Constantinople. So odious had he become to the populace of Rome by his course of duplicity and crime that upon the day of his departure he was insulted and stoned in the street, and left the city amid the maledictions of the monks. Arriving in Constantinople, he conducted himself with such insufferable insolence at the first conference of the council that the incensed emperor ordered the guards to tear from his throne the pestilent priest whose presence dishonored the assembly. Of course, Virgilius vented his vengeance in pious imprecations, menaces of excommunication, and such sorts of sacerdotal thunder, and straightway proceeded to convoke a council on his own account in hostility to the emperor. His party occupied the palace of Placidius.

The same old spirit of Christian strife that had made every council a hot-bed of hate now had licensed scope. Both parties gave themselves up to all the fury of fanaticism. At length the pontiff who had dared to brave an emperor to his beard was obliged to seek a safe sanctuary in the church of St. Peter. Justinian refused to consider the church an inviolable asylum for a criminal and presumptuous priest. He ordered the officer charged with arresting robbers and murderers to take into his custody the contumacious churchman, and sent him a detachment of soldiers as his guard. The troops entered the church with drawn swords and bended bows, and dragged the affrighted pontiff from under the altar, the pillars of which he embraced. The clerks and deacons were driven from the church with blows of the soldier's halberds, and the holy Father was violently dragged from his sanctuary by his feet and hair and beard. In the struggle to remove the vigorous Virgilius, two pillars of the altar were broken, and the holy table would have fallen and

crushed him had it not been upheld by two clerks. But during this turbulence, the populace, excited to revolt by the priests, attacked the arresting party with fury, drove the troops from the church, and supported Virgilius in his asylum. The sedition finally became so serious that the emperor was obliged to offer terms of negotiation. The proud pontiff prescribed the conditions of accommodation and was again reinstated in his old residence, the Palace of Placidius.

But no sooner was he again in the clutches of Justinian than, in violation of an emperor's plighted word, he was exposed to the most outrageous treatment. He was forcibly thrust from the palace by the meanest menials, who dragged him through the public streets, and, striking him on the cheek, cried aloud to the people, "Behold the chastisement with which our most illustrious emperor punishes this rebellious and obstinate priest; this odious pontiff, who strangled the unfortunate Silverus; this infamous sodomite, who killed with a club a poor child who resisted him."

He was afterwards taken back to the palace and guarded as a prisoner. Managing to make his escape by climbing a wall in the night, he fled to the church of St. Euphemia of Chalcedon, where, to escape the wrath of the emperor, he feigned to have fallen dangerously sick. Thereupon he was declared a heretic, his domestics were taken from him, the priests and deacons of his party were dispersed in the desert, and the once powerful pontiff was abandoned to solitude and the tortures of a painful disease which had afflicted him for years. And now, by one of those unaccountable eccentricities of the human mind so often witnessed, the contempt so long entertained for this man by the clergy and people of Rome was suddenly changed into respect and even veneration. Regarding him as a faithful confessor of the faith, banished and persecuted for the defense of his Church, they refused to choose a successor, though ordered to do so by the emperor of Italy. At last the holy Father, able to endure his exile no longer, came to the tardy resolution of submitting to the requisite conditions for obtaining his ecclesiastical privileges. He

again became animated with reveries of his old ambition. But, happily for the holy see, he did not live to realize them. While on his return to Rome to once more fasten upon the people the yoke of despotism and terror, he was poisoned by a beverage given him to drink, and died at Syracuse in the year 555. He had held the highest honor in the Christian Church for nearly nineteen years, and carried to his tomb the hatred of the Latins and the contempt of the Greeks. His memory will ever be held in execration far as his history is known. His body was taken to Rome and buried in the church of St. Marcellus. His life is one long catalogue of crime and abomination. He had attained the plenitude of pontifical power by a malicious murder. He was a sodomite and a suborner, a knave, a miser, and an assassin. He was a disgrace to human nature, a reproach upon even the worst system of religion that ever cursed the race; and his biography is a black blot upon the records of Rome even in her worst days. And yet this man, stained as he was with crime, the prince of hypocrites and perjurers, and a murderer, held the highest office in the infallible Church for nearly a score of years; and, as one of the successors of St. Peter, served as the representative of God on earth.

GREGORY THE GREAT.

We now come to the consideration of the career and character of an important personage in the line of Roman pontiffs, the most eminent protector of papal power since the time of Constantine, and one who laid the foundation of that splendid ritual which to-day constitutes the service of Catholic chapels and cathedrals from Dublin to St. Louis, from Madrid to Montreal. The life of Gregory makes an era in the history of Catholic Christianity. His advent was in an age of anarchy and darkness, and when universal madness seems to have seized upon the minds of men. Germany had been given into the hands of savages, and half-barbarous France groaned under the rule of the Merovingian monarchy; the Saxons had brought Britain back to paganism; Arian Visigoths swayed the scepter over Spain; ruthless savages ravaged Italy from the Po to the Straits of Sicily, and the emperor of the East was scarcely known beyond the bounds of his dominion. Rome was surrounded by the wreck of nations, and mankind was overshadowed with misery and desolation. In these dark and hopeless days Gregory appeared and assumed control of the destiny of the Roman Church.

He was a Roman, of a wealthy and illustrious patrician family. His father, named Gordian, was an influential member of the Senate, and his mother, Silvia, since canonized by the Church, was the daughter of Pope Felix II. We are assured by Gregory of Tours, his contemporary, that Rome at that time contained no man more distinguished for eloquence and learning. His talents procured him the title of senator upon his arrival at manhood, and attracting the attention of the emperor, Justin the Second, he finally became

governor of Rome. The death of his father left him the possessor of all the accumulated wealth of his ancestors. Enjoying the confidence of the emperor, the favorite of the court and the people, the recipient of unstinted honors and emoluments, he was able—had not religious fanaticism suddenly turned him from his career of success—to have made the most illustrious alliances in the empire, and to have elevated himself to the very steps of the throne. All that this world could give seemed subject to his command. But all at once a startling change came over him, and he hesitated in his brilliant career.

The thought flashed upon the young Roman favorite that it would be impossible to serve God in the midst of opulence and earthly pomp. His reveries turned him toward the holy retreat of the cloisters. He became a monk. He renounced his riches and his greatness, gave his immense revenues to the convents of Sicily; distributed his tasteful furniture and his valuable vessels of gold and silver among the destitute; laid aside his silken robes, glittering with gold and jewels; clad himself in the coarsest of cloth, and left the world, to perform the menial duties of a monk. He had become a half-crazed religious enthusiast. He became the abbot of the monastery of St. Andrew. Here in his fanatical fervor he gave himself up to the rigors of such absolute fasting and penance that he was seized with a long and severe sickness. A monk, named Justin, who was also a physician, watched over him with the most affectionate tenderness. At length the faithful and self-sacrificing monk was himself seized with a mortal illness. And now the cold and rigorous zeal of the unfeeling fanatic manifested itself. The dying monk, with tears of bitter contrition, confessed to have hoarded up three pieces of money contrary to the rules of the monastery. Gregory now forgot all but the guilt of the miserable monk. He punished him with the most unrelenting cruelty. He permitted no one to approach the bed of the dying man. He would not suffer his conscience to be soothed by any sacred rite nor holy consolation. His curses followed the spirit of his faithful friend

as it passed away. He caused the body to be cast upon a dunghill, together with the pieces of gold, while the assembled monks shouted their malediction, "Thy money perish with thee!"

According to Catholic chronicles, after Justus had endured purgatorial torment for thirty days, Gregory allowed a mass to be said for his suffering soul, which thereupon returned to earth to announce its escape from its frightful tortures. Such was the superstition of that age, and such is the superstition which has clung to the Church for fourteen centuries.

In 590 Pelagius the Second died of a contagious disease, and the deacon Gregory, in consideration of his ardent devotion, was chosen successor by the united voice of the clergy, the senate, and the people of Rome. His election was confirmed by the emperor Maurice. But Gregory assumed to shrink from so high and holy an office with real alarm. He wrote to the emperor in feigned humility, wishing some one more worthy ordained in his place. He even disguised himself and fled into the forest to escape being exalted to such a glorious dignity. The governor of Rome ordered emissaries to search the country for the hiding-place of the modest pontiff. It is said he was found by some shepherds in a cavern, betrayed by a pillar of fire which hovered over his head. He was seized and carried back to the city, where he was duly consecrated, notwithstanding his resistance. Under this guise of humility, Gregory concealed the most unbridled ambition. The proud deacon desired to add to the honor of the holy dignity the glory of having refused it. The truth is, he simply played the part of a dissimulating and hypocritical politician.

Gregory had many obstacles to overcome before being firmly established in the seat of St. Peter. At his accession, Italy was the prey of the fierce Lombards, who sold into slavery or massacred the whole population of great cities, and tainted the air with carnage. One day, in the early part of his pontificate, while in the midst of one of his most eloquent sermons, he was startled by the news that these savage hordes

were at the gates of the city. They had come to destroy Rome. Gregory broke off suddenly, and prepared for a desperate defense. The walls were manned by monks and trembling citizens, before the vigor of whom the assailants were obliged to retreat. But the environs of the holy city were desolated, monasteries and churches sunk into smoldering ruins, and the people were carried into captivity.

After weeping in vain over the woes of his wasted city, Gregory resolved upon a policy that should spread his intellectual influence over the whole of the West. He sought an alliance with the wild Lombards, and, upon the death of King Antuaris, he secured from his queen, Theodelinda, a pledge, in the name of Jesus Christ, to protect his provinces and the chair of St. Peter. He effected a union between her and the prince of Turin, which augmented the power of the Church by converting that monarch and his idolatrous subjects to the Catholic faith.

His was the most active mind in Europe in that age. He guided the policy of Rome, and watched the conduct of his contemporaries with the keenest attention. He corresponded with bishops and kings; addressed letters in terms of seductive persuasion to Bertha, the beautiful queen of Kent, and others of arrogant expostulation to the emperor of Constantinople; he infused new life into the decaying churches of Greece and Africa, and forwarded the conversion of the savage Saxons. His vigorous efforts were finally rewarded by seeing France, Spain, England, the warlike Huns and Goths and Lombards, all yield their united support to the see of St. Peter.

Notwithstanding his usual acuteness and the astonishing activity of his intellect, Gregory, like all religious enthusiasts, was the victim of the most senseless superstition. He had once been snatched from an early grave by the prayers of a pious associate. Angels floated over him, and spirits clustered around his sacred seat. He cast out devils, and demons departed at his approach. The realm of spirits was let loose, and the earth swarmed with its invisible citizens. On every

side were countless troops of demons, terrifying the elect and trying to destroy the Church. His boundless superstition filled the age with fearful fancies. But he found a spiritual shield against the assaults from the viewless world in the relics of saints and martyrs. A bone of a sainted bishop, or a hair from the head of John the Baptist, was a sure protection to their possessor, and a present worthy of a potentate.

Gregory displayed considerable financial ability in the disposition of these talismans. He traded a piece of the true cross and a key which contained some grains of a chain which had shackled St. Peter, with Recard, king of Spain, for an immense amount of gold and a valuable collection of jewels.

Gregory found another favorable opportunity for displaying his fervid zeal and hypocritical humility in opposing the title "Universal Bishop," which had been assumed by John the Faster, bishop of Constantinople. He pronounced him who accepted such an appellation to have the pride and character of Antichrist. This ecclesiastical Uriah Heep then ostentatiously adopted for himself the title, "Servant of the servants of God." His subsequent conduct proves that this mock pretension was, to employ a modern but very expressive phrase, altogether "too thin." The real reason of his opposition was that he himself was seeking that same universal supremacy he so vehemently condemned in his rival. Indeed, he soon after invented the fiction of certain keys, possessed of supernatural qualities, which he claimed had been committed to the successor of St. Peter, and was very profuse in his distribution of them. In presenting them to Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch, he says: "I have sent you keys of the blessed apostle Peter, your guardian, which when placed upon the sick, are wont to be resplendent with numerous miracles." This absurdity can only be attributed to the most impudent hypocrisy. The master motive of all his movements was the advancement of the see of Rome.

Thanks to the artful and successful policy of Gregory, the successors of the humble fisherman at Rome were enabled to exercise their supremacy over sovereigns and to dispose of the

crowns and kingdoms of this world at will. The successor of Gregory was constituted universal bishop and the supreme head of the Church on earth by the greatest monster in the shape of a man whose execrated memory was ever perpetuated by the pen of history. This man was a wretch named Phocas who was directly indebted to Gregory for his elevation to power. The reader will find a sketch of him elsewhere in this work. (See Boniface III.) Gregory owed his own elevation to the Eastern emperor Maurice and his queen. During a sedition of the Roman legions, under the emperor's discipline, he was dispossessed of his throne, and this Phocas, an obscure soldier, was raised to his place. For the purpose of restoring tranquillity, Maurice magnanimously abdicated the purple. And then the perfidious Phocas proceeded to the private dwelling of the dethroned emperor and coldly slaughtered his five sons before his eyes, and consummated the horrid tragedy by the assassination of the emperor himself.

After this barbarous butchery, the good and humble Gregory, since canonized as a saint by the Church, complimented the bloody murderer on his good fortune, and rendered thanks that his peculiar piety had raised him to a throne. In the exuberance of his exultation, St. Gregory thus addresses the usurper, while his hands are still reeking with the blood of his slaughtered victims: "Let the heavens rejoice and the earth be glad; and, for your illustrious deeds, let the people of every realm now be filled with gladness. May the necks of your enemies be subjected to the yoke of your supreme rule, and the hearts of your subjects, hitherto broken and depressed, be relieved by your clemency." Were we to learn the character of this bloody wretch from the letters of the holy Father, we should certainly conclude him to have been rather an angel than a man.

His letters of congratulation at the crimes of Phocas are paralleled only by those addressed to Queen Brunehaut of France, the most execrable female known in the annals of crime. He overwhelms her with emphatic praises, affirming that France

was the happiest of nations in possessing a queen endowed with the rarest virtues and the most brilliant qualities. And this by the holy head of the Church, of a woman who allied infanticide and poisoning to piety, and the most blood-curdling cruelty to superstition.

Want of space allows but a summary mention of the acts of this pontiff worthy of place in this sketch. He destroyed the monuments of Roman magnificence; he set fire to the Palatine library, founded by Augustus; he burned in the public square the works of Titus Livy, because they opposed superstitious worship; he destroyed the works of the most famous Latin poets, except a few fragments; he showed the most bitter hostility to all the human sciences; he excommunicated Didier, archbishop of Vienne, because he permitted grammar to be taught in his diocese. His pontificate was more baneful to letters than the irruptions of the Northern barbarians. His brutal fanaticism led him to war upon everything which bore the name of science or art. The rarest manuscripts were burned, priceless pictures were destroyed, the master-pieces of sculpture were broken, and buildings of the most beautiful architecture fell before the battle-axes of priests. He succeeded in establishing the papal power on the ruins of the noblest treasures of antiquity, and in perpetuating it by the ignorance and brutality of the people.

His death took place on the 12th of March, 604, after a reign of fourteen years. Under him the see of Rome became the acknowledged head of the Western Church, and his successors assumed the title of Pope. Such are the simple and well-sustained facts concerning the great Gregory. His name is enrolled among the saints of the Church. It more properly belongs in our catalogue of corrupt and criminal Champions. His character is now submitted to the consideration of the reader and the just judgment of posterity.

BONIFACE III.

Boniface III. was the first of the popes; for, previous to the year 606, when the title of universal bishop was bestowed upon him by the execrable tyrant, Phocas, there was properly no pope. It is true that the title, as derived from the Greek word, signifying father, had been used in earlier ages, but only in its general and inoffensive sense as applied to bishops without distinction. But in the present exclusive sense of the word, as designating the supreme sovereign pontiff and boasted head of the Universal Church, we are justified in saying that popery had its birth in 606, when the title was first conferred upon the subject of this sketch. All the succeeding popes have maintained the title of universal bishop, then obtained by Boniface; and the claim of Boniface, then established, has continued to be defended by them down to the present day. Inasmuch as it was a decree of the tyrant Phocas which constituted Boniface the first head of the Catholic, or Universal Church, perhaps it would not be out of place to briefly consider the character of the man who enabled a proud prelate and his successors to exercise supreme sway over the whole of Christendom, and to mold and fashion the churches at their will. This will be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable reader that the papal power, instead of having its origin from heaven, was established by a man, and a man who comes as near the embodiment of the idea of consummate depravity as can be found in the whole history of the race. This Phocas was a native of Asia Minor, of low origin, and of equally low nature. He was ignorant, cowardly, and cruel, with no ambition as a sovereign but to indulge the more freely in lust and

drunkenness. He first attained the rank of a centurion, that is, a petty office with command of a hundred men, whom he headed in a revolt against his emperor in the year 602.

Having succeeded in exciting a mutiny among the troops on the banks of the Rhine, he caused himself to be proclaimed leader of the insurgents, and marched with them to Constantinople. Says Gibbon: "So obscure had been the former condition of Phocas, that the emperor was quite ignorant of the *name* and character of his rival; but as soon as he had learned that the centurion, though bold in sedition, was timid in the face of danger, 'Alas!' cried the prince, 'if he is a coward, he will surely be a murderer!'" The Emperor Maurice, with his wife and nine children, fled upon the approach of Phocas. The successful usurper was consecrated by the patriarch of Constantinople. A violent wind compelled the fugitive emperor to land at the church of St. Autonomus, near Chalcedon. Thither the consecrated tyrant despatched his ministers of death. They dragged Maurice from his sanctuary, and after having successively murdered his five sons before his eyes, they closed the tragic scene by the execution of the emperor himself. Their bodies were cast into the sea, and their heads were exposed to the insults of the mob at Constantinople until the appearance of putrefaction. The widow and three daughters of the murdered emperor had taken refuge in one of the churches of the city, at that time regarded as an inviolable asylum. The treacherous and vindictive usurper, knowing that it would be dangerous in the beginning of his reign to alarm the Church by violating the sacredness of the sanctuary, desisted from using force, but by means of the most solemn oaths and promises of safety, prevailed upon the ladies to quit their asylum. They then fell the victims of his ferocious fury. "A matron," says Gibbon, "who commanded the respect and pity of mankind, the daughter, wife, and mother of emperors, was tortured like the meanest malefactor, and the empress Constantina, with three innocent daughters, was beheaded at Chalcedon, on the same ground

which had been stained with the blood of her husband and five sons! The hippodrome, the sacred asylum of the pleasures and the liberty of the Romans, was polluted with heads and limbs and mangled bodies; and the companions of Phocas were the most sensible that neither his favor nor their services could protect them from a tyrant, the worthy rival of the Caligulas and Domitians of the first age of the empire."

Having butchered the imperial family, the blood-thirsty tyrant next proceeded to torture and massacre all their friends and all who had betrayed the least compassion for them. The whole empire soon became the scene of public executions and private murder. Among the victims were men of the first rank and distinction. Some were inhumanly tortured before being put to death; others had their hands and feet cut off; and some were set up as marks for the raw soldiery to shoot at, in learning the use of the bow. All who spoke disrespectfully of the tyrant were immediately seized and either killed by the guards on the spot, or tied up in sacks and thrown into the sea. Such was the monster in the shape of a man, as portrayed by the pen of impartial history, by whose sovereign decree Boniface III. was constituted the first pope and supreme head of the Church on earth; and such is the foundation upon which rests the lordly title of universal bishop, which has been claimed by all the successors of Boniface, the Gregorys and Johns, Leos and Innocents, down to the late Pius, who, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, assumed to be the sole representative of heavenly infallibility, and who, from the Vatican at Rome, demanded the unlimited submission of the nations of the earth. The right of such a bloody brute as this Phocas to elevate a mortal to the station of monarch of Christendom will be submitted to the common sense of the reader.

IRENE.

THE most execrable names that blacken the scroll of infamy are those of ambitious or fanatical females. Cleopatra poisoned her brother and sister that she alone might sway the sceptre of the Ptolemies, and Laodice poisoned her five children to secure for herself the throne of Cappadocia. To these may be added the name of that female Christian fiend, Irene, the Christian empress of the East, a woman notorious for the commission of a crime which has made humanity to shudder through all the after ages. Born at Athens in 752, of very obscure parentage, she became the wife of Louis IV., emperor of Constantinople, in 769. At his death, in 780, he left a son of ten years, named Constantine, and during his minority she acted as regent. She was a woman of remarkable beauty, and greatly celebrated for her energy and talents. Her reign was during the period when the subject of image worship was convulsing the East with bitter and riotous animosity. The iconoclastic controversy tore the empire with sedition; emperors and clergy, ecclesiastics and laymen, were engaged in setting up images or in destroying them. The origin of iconoclasm was due to the Khalif Yezed, who completed the destruction of the Syrian images. In 726 Leo the Isaurian, a great sovereign who by his merit alone had risen from obscurity and become the founder of a new dynasty at Constantinople, published an edict prohibiting the worship of images. He afterwards issued another, directing their destruction, and the whitewashing of the walls of churches ornamented with them.

The clergy and the monks rebelled; the emperor was denounced as an Infidel and a Mohammedan. He ordered

the removal of a statue of Christ in the part of the city called Chalcopratia. A riot was the consequence. An officer mounted a ladder and struck the idol with an axe upon its face. The sacred image which had worked so many miracles proved unable to protect itself. A rabble of women interfered in its behalf. They threw down the ladder and killed the officer. Before the riot ended troops were called in and a fearful massacre was committed. The tumult spread throughout the empire, and an attempt was made to proclaim a new emperor. His son and successor, Constantine, pursued the iconoclastic policy. He was generally considered an Atheist. The patriarch of Constantinople deposed upon oath that Constantine had made the most irreligious confessions to him, as that Jesus Christ, so far from being the son of God, was in his opinion, a mere man, born of his mother in the common way. The emperor took his revenge on the patriarch for this indiscreet revelation by seizing him, putting out his eyes, and causing him to be led through the city mounted on an ass with his face to the tail. In 754 he summoned a council at Constantinople, which was attended by three hundred and eighty-eight bishops. It decreed that all visible symbols of Christ were heretical and blasphemous, and directed that all statues and paintings be removed from the churches and destroyed. This decision caused a clamor. From their caves and the tops of their pillars, the monks rose in an uproar. They insulted the emperor to his face, and denounced him as a second apostate Julian. Constantine sought to deliver himself by the scourging, strangling, and drowning of individuals. Finding the monks everywhere arrayed against the government, the emperor determined to destroy monasticism itself. He drove them from their cells and cloisters, and gave up their buildings for civil uses; obliged the consecrated virgins to marry; and finally he took the patriarch of Constantinople, degraded him from his office, scourged him, shaved off his eye-brows, set him for public derision in the circus in a sleeveless shirt, and then struck off his head. Constantine was succeeded by his son Leo

IV. (known also as Leo the Chazar) the husband of Irene. During his reign of five years he continued the iconoclastic policy. On his death Irene seized the government, ostensibly in behalf of her son. This wicked and superstitious woman undertook the restoration of images. She summoned another council at Nicea which authorized the worship of images as agreeable to Scripture and reason, and which denounced the synod of Constantinople as one of fools and Atheists. The empress reëstablished the worship of images, and was saluted as a second Helena by the idolatrous monks.

Although a zealous Christian, Irene was one of the few female monsters in whom ambition and love of power prevailed over natural affection. When her son attained his majority she refused to surrender to him the throne, which was his by natural right. She caused him to be seized, and in the porphyry chamber of the palace, to which she had borne him, put out his eyes. This unnatural deed appalled Constantinople, familiar as it was with fearful crimes. In 802 her subjects formed a conspiracy against her under the leadership of Nicepharus, who deposed her and was made emperor himself. She died in exile in 803. Thus closed the infamous career of this Christian female fiend, an ambitious usurper, a woman preëminent in piety and perfidy and crime, but who, nevertheless, was set forth by a large portion of the Christian world as an exemplar of the true faith; and as such she deserves a prominent place among the pious plagues that have afflicted the race.

PEPIN.

Pepin, surnamed the Short, was the first of the Carlovingian kings. He was the son of the celebrated Charles Martel, the great hero of that age, who had received his surname, signifying hammer, in honor of the great victory he had won in 732 over the Saracens at Tours. The Arabian invaders had reached the center of France, and threatened the subjugation of Europe to the religion of Mohammed. At this time Charles was mayor of the palace to the king of France, but possessed in his own person all the power of the kingdom. He was verily the hammer which checked the career of the victorious invaders and crushed three hundred and seventy-five thousand of them on the battle field of Tours and determined the religious destiny of Europe.

Upon his death in 741 his son Pepin succeeded him as mayor of the palace. Childeric III. was king of France. He was the last of the degenerate dynasty, best known in history as the phantom kings. In his capacity as mayor, Pepin possessed a power superior to his sovereign. But he desired to obtain the title of king as well as the authority. He determined to dethrone the feeble monarch. Zachary was pope at this period. Both had need of each other. Zachary wanted liberation from the Lombards; Pepin wanted the crown of France. And so they came to an understanding and resolved to combine their temporal and spiritual powers for mutual advantage. Hereafter the interests of Pepin and the pope were interwoven. They were both actuated by the most artful machinations. The holy Father knew full well that Pepin was ambitious to usurp the diadem, and had only been deterred from fear of that devout Frankish warrior,

the celebrated Carloman. At length the retirement of the latter left Pepin free to act. To satisfy the scruples of the superstitious, the prudent Pepin resolved to submit the case of conscience to the pontiff, namely: Who best deserved to be called king, he who possessed the title without the power, or he who possessed the power without the title. The pope, exposed to the attacks of the dreaded Lombards, was in the utmost want of the favor and protection of the powerful Pepin. Of course, he returned an answer that "he only ought to be king who exercised the royal power." The feeble Childeric was at once deposed and confined to a monastery, and the mighty mayor of the palace was proclaimed king in his place. He was duly crowned and anointed by Boniface, the pope's legate, and thus became the founder of a new dynasty on the decaying throne of Clovis. Events soon confirmed the foresight of the holy Father. The Lombards invaded Italy, conquered the exarchate, and advanced in threatening and terrible triumph toward Rome. The panic-struck pope hastened to the camp of Pepin, clad with sackcloth and ashes, to ask the assistance of his arms in defense of the Church. This was granted upon condition that the supplicant would sanction his acts of usurpation and comply with his ambitious wishes. To these terms Zachary speedily acceeded, and consented to anoint the two sons of Pepin with the holy oil which he pretended had been brought by a dove from heaven. Thereupon Pepin drew his sword and reconquered the greater part of Italy. He donated to his spiritual benefactor the long fought for provinces of the exarchate. The powerful Franks became the protectors of the papacy. And thus was founded, by Catholic France, the civil power of the Roman Church. But the fierce Lombards did not submit without a further struggle. Again they threatened the Holy City with destruction. This was during the pontificate of Stephen III., who applied, in an agony of terror, to Pepin for protection. To insure the success of his appeals, Stephen had recourse to the most presumptuous of all the pious frauds. This was a letter purporting to be addressed to Pepin by the

apostle Peter himself, and in his own handwriting. In this singular epistle, St. Peter and the Holy Virgin adjure the French king to save their city from the Lombards, and peace and prosperity, paradise and perpetual victory are promised him as his rewards. Pepin submitted to the heavenly summons, and again unsheathed his sword for the pope and St. Peter. His arms again prevailed, and, after a faint resistance, the ferocious Lombards were forced to submit. As the price of peace, they signed at Pavia a treaty to put the pope in possession of the exarchate, and to deliver to him "all the cities, castles, and territories thereto belonging, to be forever held by the most holy Pope Stephen and his successors in the apostolic see of St. Peter." This instrument was signed by Pepin himself, by his two sons, and by the chief barons of the kingdom, and was laid, together with the keys of each city specified in the donation, upon the tomb of St. Peter. The pope was thereby put in possession of the so long wished for principality, and raised to the rank of an earthly king. In his "Lives of the Popes," Bower says: "And now, that we have seen the temporal power united in the popes to the spiritual, the crown to the mitre, and the sword to the keys, I shall leave them for a while, with two short observations: 1. That as their spiritual power, so also their temporal power, was owing to a usurper; the one to Phocas, and the other to Pepin; 2. That as they most bitterly inveighed against the patriarchs of Constantinople as the forerunners of the Antichrist for assuming the title of universal bishop, and yet laid hold of the first opportunity that offered to assume that very title themselves; so did they inveigh against the Lombards as the most wicked of men, for usurping the dominions of their 'most religious sons,' the emperors; and yet they themselves usurped the dominions of their 'most religious sons' just as soon as they had it in their power."

Pepin died at St. Denis in 768. He was the first prince who bestowed upon the bishops of Rome the authority and dominions of a temporal sovereign. As the champion of St. Peter, he had raised Rome to new grandeur and importance,

and conferred upon the successors of the feeble fisherman the prerogative of controlling crowns and kingdoms, and exercising supremacy over monarchs and the mighty of the earth. Henceforth the pope wears an earthly crown. He is no longer an humble bishop, begging aid of the barbarous Frank. Henceforth, thanks to the usurper Pepin, he is a successor of the Cæsars, a master of mankind, flourishing the terrible weapons of anathema and excommunication over emperors, nobles, and nations.

CHARLEMAGNE.

THE names of Constantine and Charlemagne mark the two most important eras in the history of Christianity. First proclaimed by a few humble fishermen along the shores of Galilee, the gospel of the manger-born son of Mary had been accepted by the first Christian emperor of Rome, confirmed by council and creed, and established upon the throne of the Cæsars. Five centuries later it was given the prestige of imperial power and grafted upon the great empire of the West by that famous Frankish freebooter, Charlemagne. Near the close of the eighth century the fleets of the Saracens dominated in the Mediterranean, and their armies had wrested from Christendom nearly all the countries of the East. Jerusalem and Carthage, Antioch and Alexandria, had passed from Christian domination. Their bishops had disappeared; and of all the great episcopal seats only Constantinople and Rome were left. The latter lay at the mercy of Arian Lombards and the barbarous hordes of Germany; everywhere the imperial power seemed paralyzed, and even communication between the two great capitals of the Roman world was at the sufferance of Mohammedan navies.

The Arabs had made themselves masters of Spain, and boasted that they would speedily traverse the Pyrenees and the Alps, and proclaim the name of Mohammed on the seven hills. Aistolpho, at the head of his Lombards, brandished his sword before the city gates and threatened to put every Roman to death. Christ came to bring a sword, and it was needful that the sword should be called into requisition. Pope Zachary wanted liberation from the Lombards, and Pepin le Bref wanted the crown of France. And so the warlike

Franks unsheathed their swords in defense of the "Republic of God." Pepin recovered from the Lombards their conquests from the Romans, deposited the keys of the conquered cities on the altar of St. Peter's, caused himself to be raised by his soldiers on a buckler and proclaimed king while the bishops anointed him with oil.

When the succeeding pope, Stephen II., visited France, he placed the diadem on Pepin's brow, and anointed him, his wife, and children with holy oil in the monastery of St. Denis. Thus, by the sword of a successful soldier, the bishop of Rome became a temporal sovereign, and the keys of St. Peter became firmly bound to the hilt of the sword. Such was the state of affairs when Charlemagne appeared. This mighty monarch was the son of Pepin, born at the castle of Salzburg, in Bavaria, in 742. Upon the death of his father in 768, he succeeded to the crown conjointly with his brother Carloman. He became king of the vast possessions then known as Austrasia, Neustria, etc., while his brother Carloman obtained the rest of his father's dominions. Upon the death of Carloman in 771, Charlemagne became master of the whole. The empire then embraced France, Spain, Italy, and Germany. He married Desiree, a daughter of Desiderius of Lombardy. At the accession of Charlemagne to the government, all the ancient landmarks of social order had been overthrown with the colossal power of Rome, and the whole civilized world was covered with its ruins and infested with its crimes. The ancient seat of empire was divided among a score of petty tyrants; the Saracens had overrun Spain and threatened the farther west; the northern kingdoms of Europe were only known as the cradle of adventurous armies; Russia did not even exist, and England was just emerging from the confusion of the Heptarchy.

The unbounded ambition and vast genius of Charlemagne were made subservient to the papacy for the building up of a powerful Christian protectorate in the West. Such a power was necessary as a counterpoise to the Eastern empire of Irene and the splendid sovereignty of Haroun-al-Raschid.

At the entreaty of Pope Stephen III., he entered Italy, subjugated the Lombards, and united the territories of Lombardy to France.

His successful arms were next turned against Aquitaine, which he reduced to subjection in 770. Encouraged by the Roman pontiff, and prompted by that warlike religious zeal which has ever deluged with blood the altars of the Church, he next took up arms for the Christianization of the still idolatrous Saxons.

In 772 he commenced a conflict with that valiant and stubborn people, which was maintained for upwards of thirty years. His crusades against the unconverted Saxons were attended with slow success. As the circle of his power extended, he everywhere founded churches and established bishoprics, enriching them with territorial possessions. To the petty sovereigns whom he subdued he granted the title of counts. He always insisted upon the rite of baptism as a sign of submission. Resistance to this saving ceremony was punished with the most appalling barbarity. "Be baptized, or be damned," enjoined the Gospel; "Be baptized, or be beheaded," commanded Charlemagne. The conquered Saxons had to choose between baptism and death.

One day in 782 this Christian butcher cut off the heads of four thousand five hundred persons at Verden who refused the baptismal rite, which to them only signified the most servile submission. Of course, the influence of Christianity extended fast, sustained by the successful sword of this bloodthirsty champion. He had made a solemn engagement with the papacy to enforce Roman Christianity upon Europe wheresoever his power could reach: and most fearfully did he observe his obligation by carrying into execution the penalty of death he had awarded to the crimes of, 1. Refusing baptism: 2. False pretense of baptism; 3. Relapse from Christianity: 4. The murder of a priest or bishop; 5. Human sacrifice: 6. Eating meat in Lent. Verily, his sword was a terrible, but convincing missionary. To the day of his death he observed a savage fidelity to his bond with the head of the

Church. And in return Pope Leo III., after the celebration of the holy mysteries in the church of St. Peter at Rome, on Christmas day, 800, placed on his head a diadem, amid the acclamations of the people, "Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus, crowned by God, the great and pacific emperor of the Romans." His head and body were anointed with the holy oil, and after the example of the Cæsars, the pontiff himself saluted or adored him. He might now be appropriately distinguished the "Emperor of the West," for his empire comprised all the region between the Elbe and the Ebro, extending eastward to Hungary and southward to Calabria. He manifested his appreciation of St. Peter by his princely munificence to that apostle. At the request of the pope he substituted the Gregorian for the Ambrosian chant in his dominions; and wherever his priests or singers resisted, he burnt them along with their books.

The private life of Charlemagne was stained with great immoralities and crimes. After having divorced his first wife, he indulged in a polygamy scarcely inferior to the caliphs, solacing himself with not less than nine wives and many concubines. He sought to increase this number by a marriage with Irene, the infamous Christian empress of the East, who put out the eyes of her own son in the porphyry chamber of Constantinople. Before the union was consummated, however, the inhuman empress was dethroned and exiled.

Charlemagne was the most powerful monarch of his time, and his fame spread into Asia. His favor was courted by the Caliph Haroun-al-Raschid, who in 801 sent him from Bagdad the keys of the holy sepulchre as a mark of esteem from the commander of the Faithful to the greatest of Christian kings. Only an incomplete catalogue of his most important military movements can be given in this limited space. The early part of his reign was considerably occupied in subduing the rebellion of his subjects. In 773 he crossed the Alps, and was crowned king of Lombardy, and was granted the right of confirming the papal elections. In 778 he carried his arms

into Spain, and pursued his victorious arms as far as the Ebro, but was surprised on his return in the pass of Roncesvalles, where many of his knights perished, among whom was his nephew Roland, the hero of continental romance. In 780 his youngest son, Louis le Debonnaire, was crowned by the pope king of Aquitaine, and Pepin, his next oldest son, king of Italy. The ceremonies were celebrated at Rome with the most imposing magnificence. His son Pepin died in 810. In 813 he associated his other son, Louis le Debonnaire, with himself in the empire. He invaded Pannonia, and extended his dominions in that direction to the mountains of Bohemia. During the latter years of his life he was engaged in fortifying the coasts of France against the Northmen, and various matters relating to the security of the empire. He died at Aix-la-Chapelle, his capital, January 28, 814, in the seventy-first year of his age, and the forty-seventh of his reign.

Before his death he confirmed the succession of his son Louis by an august ceremony. Placing the imperial crown upon the altar, he ordered Louis to take it with his own hands and crown himself, thereby indicating that he wore it in his own right. His descendants are denominated Carlovingians, and constitute the second dynasty of French kings.

Such, epitomized, is the career of a man whose advent marks an epoch in modern history, and whose sword shaped the map of Europe. He was a great and remarkable man in many respects, a man of genius, a wise sovereign, and a victorious warrior. Though he himself never succeeded in learning how to write, he seems to have been a liberal patron of letters in the empire. Only this much does impartial history speak in his praise. He was immoral and ambitious, cruel and intolerant; he was a polygamist, a wholesale murderer, and a Christian zealot. Still, he was great. He was a great ruler, a great robber, and a great butcher. He was great in that which will forever render his name infamous in the memory of mankind. He was the greatest propagator of Christianity since the time of Constantine. He gave to the papal Church its lease of power over the governments of

earth, its ecclesiastical supremacy that only succumbed before the successful arms of Victor Emanuel and the mighty, resistless heaves of progress in this nineteenth century. He sought the compulsory Christianization of his subjects; and his effectual missionary was the sword. His sole argument with unbaptized Saxons was death or immersion. He exalted the Church above the State, and confirmed the claim of the holy see to secular sovereignty. To conclude, Charlemagne was a great general and a great Christian, but a sanguinary and victorious villain.

PASCHAL I.

THE career of Paschal is an instance of the way in which an unscrupulous and designing man may, from a beginning of humble thievery, rise to all the dignity and glory of gilded infamy. Born of influential parents and reared in the palace of the Lateran, he easily procured, while yet young, a lucrative position in the monastery of St. Stephen in Rome. His was the office of almoner, and his duty consisted in distributing the money left by the wealthy for the benefit of the poor. His peculiar method of discharging this duty may be surmised by a knowledge of the fact that his wealth was immense after a few years' strict devotion to the business of relieving the wants of the poor. The money intrusted to his charge, when not added to his private store, was distributed where it would do the most good, after the manner of our modern election funds.

So well did he sow his golden seed among the prototypes of our modern lobbyists and ward politicians, that when his plans were ripe he reaped a rich harvest of politico-ecclesiastical influence.

Upon the death of Stephen V., Paschal, by a skillful manipulation of the influence at his command, was chosen to fill the papal chair. Without waiting for the assent of the emperor of the West, which had been necessary to legalize the consecration of previous popes, he, on the fourteenth of February, 817, caused himself to be consecrated as pope of Rome.

As may be supposed, Louis, who was then emperor of the West, was incensed at having his prerogative thus ignored; but Paschal placed the blame upon the Romans, who he said

had obliged him to be consecrated immediately, that he might be enabled to exercise his pontifical functions. Louis then notified the people of Rome that they must in future preserve more religiously the customs of his ancestors; and here the matter ended, but a feeling of enmity remained between the prince and the pontiff.

Under the management of Paschal, the court of Rome soon became a formidable power. The emperors of the East, under the influence of the pope, ruined nations, and robbed and murdered thousands, and sent the spoils of the vanquished to fill the coffers of this representative of a merciful and loving God. Upon the money thus gathered, the religious Romans, from the pope to the page, reveled in licentious debauchery, and Rome soon became a hot-bed of vice and iniquity.

Lothaire, the oldest son of the Emperor Louis, came to Rome to be consecrated by the pontiff. Seeing the disorder and debauchery then existing in Rome, particularly in the papal palace, he remonstrated with Paschal, and even threatened him in the name of his father, the emperor, to hand over an account of the state of religious morals in Rome to a council. The pontiff promised an immediate reformation: but as soon as the young prince quitted Italy, he arrested Theodore, the primiciary of the Roman Church, and Leo, the nomenclator, two venerable and virtuous priests, and accused them of having injured him by exposing his vices and crimes to the young prince. Notwithstanding the proofs of their innocence, he caused them to be conducted to the palace of the Lateran, and, without trial of any kind, had their eyes forced from their sockets and their tongues torn from their throats in his presence, and this merely because he suspected them of having told the truth. He then handed them over to the executioner to be beheaded.

Backed in his criminal course by the Eastern rulers, he bid defiance to those who would gladly have dragged him to justice, and his crime was soon covered through fear of his power.

After a reign of seven years and three months, when at the summit of his fame and infamy, he made his peace with that God he had so faithfully served, and, on the eleventh of May, 824, gave up the ghost. The Church, true to its custom of selecting its saints from the vilest of mankind, canonized the wretch, and does honor to his remains yearly on the fourteenth day of May.

POPESS JOAN.

"At the beginning of the ninth century, Charles the Great, after having subdued the Saxons, desired to convert them to Christianity, and sent to England for learned priests, who could second him in his plans. In the number of the professors who passed over into Germany was an English priest, accompanied by a young girl whom he had taken into his family to conceal her grossness. The lovers were obliged to interrupt their journey, and stopped at Mayence, where the young English woman gave birth to a daughter, whose adventures were one day to occupy the attention of future ages; this woman was Joan" (Marianus Scotus).

Authors do not agree as to the name she bore in her infancy, some calling her Agnes, others Gerberte, while the Jesuit Sevarius asserts that she was also called Isabella, Marguerite, Dorothea, and Justa; but she is called Joan by far the greater number. The old chroniclers represent her as having been a girl of extraordinary beauty and intelligence. Her father was a learned man, and her mind received the most careful cultivation from him. It is related that at the age of twelve years her instruction, even in scientific subjects, equaled that of the most learned professors of the palatinate, and that her replies excited the admiration and wonder of all the doctors who approached her.

But at length love took the place of learning and changed the destinies of Joan. Her lover was a young monk of the abbey of Fulda. Joan followed the leadings of her heart, and fled with him from the paternal roof. She disguised herself in male attire, and, under the name of English John, followed her lover into the abbey of Fulda. Here she was placed

under the direction of the learned Raban-Maur. But such was the constraint under which they found themselves at the convent that they quit it to continue their studies in England. They soon acquired all that the schools of Great Britain could teach them. They then set out on a course of travel to learn the manners and languages of other countries. Joan, still disguised in the frock of a monk, disputed with all the learned doctors that fell in her way. They first visited France, where Joan excited the admiration of such celebrated characters as the duchess Septimania, St. Anscairus, Bertram, and Loup de Ferriere. Traversing Gaul, the lovers embarked at Marseilles for Greece.

At this period old Athens was the centre of science, the focus of learning and polite literature. Joan was then but twenty years old, and in the full flower of her wondrous beauty. Her monastic habit amply concealed her sex, and there, under the beautiful skies of Greece, the two English monks pursued their studies unsuspected for three years. Under the most skillful masters, assisted with the best scientific apparatus the world afforded, Joan made prodigious advancement in universal knowledge. Her vast learning and unrivaled eloquence filled with astonishment her captivated audiences. At length her lover suddenly sickened and died, after an illness of but a few hours. This was a terrible blow to Joan. Left alone, and feeling herself abandoned on the earth, she determined to quit Greece. Perhaps one consideration with her was the difficulty in concealing her sex in a land where long beards were worn. At Rome the men were required to keep closely shaved. There was also a larger theatre for her ambition there than in Greece.

And so Joan set out for the holy city. Upon her arrival she secured a situation in the school of the Greeks as a teacher of the seven liberal arts. This academy had already become celebrated under St. Augustine. Joan still further added to its renown. Her audiences were immense. Her eloquence is spoken of as enchanting. She not only continued the studies already taught, but introduced a course of

abstract sciences which were continued three years, during which time the young professor became famous as the greatest genius of the age. Lords and priests and doctors were among her disciples, and in their admiration the people gave her the name of the Prince of the Wise.

Says Marianus: "Her conduct was as commendable as her abilities; the modesty of her discourse, her manners, the regularity of her morals, her piety, and her good works, shone forth as a light before men." But beneath this hypocritical mask Joan was concealing a gigantic project.

The health of Pope Leo IV. was failing, and Joan's ambition prompted her to intrigue for the throne of St. Peter. At last Leo went the way of all flesh, and the popular professor was unanimously placed at the head of the Roman Church. After an imposing and magnificent ceremony, Joan, attired in the pontifical ornaments, proceeded to the patriarchal palace, accompanied by an immense retinue of cardinals and clergy, deacons and dignitaries of the Church, and took possession of the apostolical chair. This was in the year 853. Joan now enjoyed the full realization of her ambitious dreams, and exercised the supreme authority of the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. Abbots and archbishops, priests and princes and prelates, were now her faithful servants, and showed their religious reverence by kissing her feet.

For three years this woman discharged the duties of a Roman pontiff, and conducted the political affairs of the court of Rome with a wisdom that filled Christendom with admiration. The skill of her administration, the purity of her life, and her extraordinary abilities secured for her the respect of the whole world. But a fearful fall awaited her. The pedestal of her power and glory was suddenly broken, and Rome stood appalled at the awful spectacle.

At the period of Rogations in 855, which was celebrated by a pompous procession, the Popess Joan, as usual, appareled in the papal costume, mounted her horse and proceeded to St. Peter's church, preceded by the cross and sacred banners, and accompanied by cardinals, nobles, and large crowds of

people. Arriving at the ampitheatre of Domitian, called the Colosseum, she was suddenly seized with the pains of childbirth, the reins dropped from her hands, and she fell from her horse upon the pavement. The wretched woman was disrobed of the sacred ornaments, and in the midst of the immense crowd, with frightful convulsions, the pope of Rome gave birth to a child in the public street. The priests crowded around her to conceal the shameful spectacle from the people, and during her paroxysms of pain threatened her with the most terrible punishment. She died in the arms of the cardinal priest who had sustained her during her sufferings.

Thus died the Popess Joan, after having ruled Rome more than three years. The exasperated priests strangled her child upon the spot. But the citizens of Rome, in consideration of the respect they had so long entertained for her, consented to perform for her the last duties, and they placed her body and that of her child in a tomb on the very spot where the tragic transaction had taken place. A chapel was erected over her tomb, adorned with a marble statue, representing her clothed in papal attire, with a tiara upon her head and holding a young child in her arms. Pope Benedict III. caused this image to be broken. The ruins of the chapel were to be seen in Rome as late as the fifteenth century.

This event confounded the clergy of Rome. The sacerdotal power had been scandalized and the papal chair disgraced forever by this strange occurrence. A decree was immediately made prohibiting the pontiffs from traversing the street in which the abominable affair happened. Afterwards, on the day of Rogations, the processions from St. Peter's to St. John's made a long circuit to shun the spot where the scandal happened, and to this day there is a certain street in Rome into which the papal procession never enters.

Precautions were at once adopted upon the death of Joan to prevent the repetition of a like imposture. A ceremony was devised for such a special purpose, and the successor of Joan was the first to be submitted to its singular provisions.

It is unnecessary to give a detailed account of this ceremony, and perhaps it might be of questionable propriety to do so in this place: but suffice it to say, it consisted in a satisfactory examination of the person of the pontiff by two deacons and assistants appointed for that purpose. In the course of this ceremony use was made of two pierced chairs. Mention is made of these chairs in the consecration of Honorius II. in 1061: that of Paschal in 1099; in that of Urban VI. in 1378, and in that of the infamous Alexander VI., the father of five children and the seducer of his own daughter. The use of these chairs continued until the sixteenth century, and Crassus, master of ceremonies of Leo X., gave a minute report in the journals of Paris of all the particulars of the proof of the pierced chair to which that pontiff was submitted.

But owing to the improvement of manners and the ridicule that attended such an absurd and inconvenient custom, the practice was finally discontinued. The spectacle was judged to be injurious to public morals. The *holy* chairs were put away in the gallery of the palace of Lateran. Father Mabillon, during his journey into Italy in 1685, examined these chairs with the closest scrutiny and gave a minute description of them. He says they were of porphyry, and similar in form to a sick-couch.

Some ultra-Catholics, firm in the faith that God would not have permitted St. Peter's chair, founded by Jesus Christ himself, to be thus scandalized by a shameless woman, have stubbornly refused to admit the proof of a female pope; but the truth of the above facts are amply attested by the most authentic documents of history. The Ultramontanes of the Catholic Church, unable, from the overwhelming evidence to deny the existence of the Popess Joan, have regarded her pontificate as a vacancy in the holy see, and make Benedict III. to succeed Leo IV., holding that a woman could not perform the sacerdotal functions of a successor of St. Peter. Over thirty ecclesiastical authors admit the above-given facts, while refusing to place Joan in the list of popes.

In the cathedral of Sienna, about the middle of the fifteenth

century, were placed the marble busts of all the popes down to Pius II., who then sat upon the papal stool; and among the number, between that of Leo IV. and Benedict III., was placed the portrait of Joan, with this inscription, "John the Eighth, the female pope." This proves incontestably that a woman gloriously worked her way into the sacred ranks of the rulers of the Church of Rome; and had not the custom of the Church been stronger than truth, Joan would be universally counted as the one hundred and eighth pope. Notwithstanding, fanatical Catholics, aware of the scorn and ridicule which the reign of a female would bring upon their religion, have treated the story of Joan as a fable; and even some Protestant authors have been so illy informed upon the matter as to regard Joan a myth. All the most equitable and trustworthy writers, Catholic as well as Protestant, have frankly admitted the truth respecting the pontificate of Joan. Some of the Catholic authors attempt to defend her reputation, and to prove that the popess honored the Roman see by the splendor of her talents and the display of Christian virtues. On the contrary, Baronius regarded her as a monster, whom heretics had evoked from hell by witchcraft and incantation as a curse to the holy Church. Florimond de Raymond compared her to a second Hercules, who had been sent by heaven as a reproach upon the Roman religion. The English historian Alexander Cook attempts to rescue her memory from the aspersions of her adversaries, and give her a place in the chronological order of the history of the popes. The Jesuit Labbe pronounced the story of the Popess Joan a fable, accusing Luther and Calvin of having originated it; but five hundred years before their time Marianus had written his history of her. He could not have copied from them.

The honest Launoy thus candidly confesses the truth of the story: "It is true that the contemporary ecclesiastics of the times of Leo IV. and Benedict III., through an excessive zeal for religion, have not spoken of this remarkable woman; but their successors, less scrupulous, have at last uncovered the mystery." Marianus Scotus was a devout Catholic. He

is recognized by the world as a truthful, judicious, and unprejudiced historian. His probity and ability have never been questioned; and he is the principal authority for the facts herein related concerning Joan. More than a century before his time various authors had given several versions of her pontificate. He thoroughly examined them all, cleared up all doubts, and as the most learned and conscientious chronicler of his time, his manuscripts, left in the abbey of Fulda, should be received as the highest authority, and as conclusive against anything that the Jesuits can adduce against the existence of the Popess Joan. His attachment to the Roman Church is amply attested by his defense of Gregory VII. against the emperor Henry IV.

There are manuscripts in all the principal libraries of Germany and France, of Oxford and the Vatican, which make mention of Joan. There are autograph manuscripts of monks preserved in the library of the Dome, in France, which contain the minutest details of her history. Now, is it reasonable to suppose that the proudest popes of the Church, laying claim to infallibility, such as Gregory IX., Victor III., Urban II., Paschal II., all contemporaries of Marianus, would have suffered him to fill his history with a story so disgraceful to the religion of Rome, had there not been the most indisputable testimony to support it? Would not all the ecclesiastical writers of the age have given the lie to such an impious and scandalous story?

And so, against the most authentic documents of history, against the amplest testimony of Catholic authors themselves, all that can be adduced in disproof of the story of Joan is the simple negative assertion of those whose reading upon the subject has been limited to Jesuitical writers. Even those Catholic authors who deny the elevation of a female pope admit that there was some mysterious occurrence which broke the succession of the papal sovereigns at the time Joan wore the sacerdotal mitre.

The authorities consulted for this brief biographical sketch are those which no scholar, Catholic or Protestant, will gain-

say. Among them may be mentioned Mosheim, Baronius, Raymond, Cook, Launoy, Marianus Scotus, De Cormenin, Loughborough, etc.

The supremacy and infallibility of Mother Church rests upon the regular succession of the Roman pontiffs. There was never a devout Catholic who did not sincerely believe that Christ placed Peter in the papal chair and committed to him the keys. But the stubborn facts of history mock the claim that the successor of St. Peter—the vicegerent of God and the visible head of the Church on earth—has always been chosen by inspiration in the holy conclave and determined from on high. The most notable instance on record is the elevation of Joan to the pontifical throne. And all the pompous pretensions of the splendid papal hierarchy resting upon an unbroken chain founded upon the rock, Peter, becomes a fitting subject of scorn as history points her unerring finger to the fact of a female pope giving birth to a child in the streets of Rome. Says the Roman Catholic historian, De Cormenin: "The majesty of the priesthood, the pontifical infallibility, the pretensions of the holy see to universal rule, all that scaffolding of superstition and idolatry on which is placed the chair of St. Peter, falls before a female pope."

NICHOLAS I.

We are now entering upon a period in which the popes play an important part in the politics of Europe. Their history is one of intrigue and unholy alliances, of pious plots, oppression, and plunder. Their chief aim was to enlarge and confirm their temporal power and territories, that fatal gift which had been procured from the superstitious usurpers, Phocus and Pepin, and guaranteed by the policy of the Christian conqueror, Charlemagne. They arrogated to themselves the powers of war and peace, and, in their sublime excess of pride and presumption, set themselves above the judgment of men. For a thousand years the sovereign pontiffs of Rome ruled Europe with their rod of delegated power, and filled Christendom with fear and anarchy and bloodshed.

Nicholas I. came into power in 858. His insupportable pride and apostolic vigor give him a prominent place among the popes. He was born at Rome, and was the son of a poor physician. He was made subdeacon in the patriarchal palace by Pope Sergius II. He was afterwards made private secretary to Benedict III., and was entrusted with the most secret affairs of the Church. Nicholas became very much attached to his protector, and at his death performed the last duties with his own hands, placing him in his shroud, and bearing him, with the assistance of several other deacons, to his sepulchre.

During the delay of the Emperor Louis to reach Rome for the purpose of naming a successor, the holy see remained vacant an entire month. Immediately upon the arrival of the prince, the clergy and people proceeded to choose a new pontiff, and elected Nicholas by their united suffrages. The

ceremony of consecration was celebrated in the presence of the emperor with every circumstance of ostentatious magnificence. Upon this august occasion the holy Father exhibited more presumption and pride than had been shown by his predecessors. He was the first pope who caused his consecration to be celebrated by a brilliant enthronement. The audacious example of this proud pontiff became a precedent for posterity. He exacted of the emperor that he should come on foot to meet him, and conduct him by leading his horse by the bridle from the church of St. Peter to the palace of the Lateran. Upon taking leave of the pope, the superstitious monarch bent his forehead in the dust and kissed his sandals. And thus he commenced his pontificate of nine years and a half, during which he commanded people and potentates as if he had been the sovereign of the universe. Indeed, he set himself up as God upon earth.

In the following decree he expressly declares himself co-equal with God: "It is evident that the popes can neither be bound nor unbound by any earthly power, nor even by that of the apostle if he should return upon earth; since Constantine the Great has recognized that the pontiffs held the place of God upon the earth, the divinity not being able to be judged by any living man. We are then infallible, and whatever may be our acts, we are not accountable for them but to ourselves."

During his reign Rome was agitated by a great scandal. The deacon Hubert had been surprised in the night in the bedchamber of Queen Thietberge, his sister, the wife of Lothaire, king of Lorraine. Nicholas was for a long time engaged in investigating this accusation of incest. The beauty and presents of Queen Theitberge prevailed with the pontiff in securing a judgment in her favor. He pronounced her innocent, and condemned the king to take back his discarded wife under penalty of excommunication. He also convoked a council at Milan, to try an accusation of adultery against the fair Ingeltrude, wife of Count Boson of Lombardy, whose treasures she had stolen before flying with her

lover. Failing to appear before the council, the beautiful sinner was condemned by the pope as an adulteress, and driven from the communion of the faithful. But the anathema of the holy Father produced no effect on the contumacious countess. When the papal envoys presented the decree to her she threw it into the fire, and laughing, returned this sarcastic reply: "If your pope Nicholas is about to assemble synods to make women faithful, and to prevent adultery, I declare to you he will lose his time and his Latin; he had better reform the abominable morals of his clergy, and extirpate sodomy from his own house." This rendered the holy Father furious. He excommunicated her the second time, and had her driven from the dioceses of his dominions. The obdurate adulteress retired to Cologne, where she contracted a criminal connection with a bishop.

Another important affair soon diverted the attention of the court of Rome from Ingeltrude. Baldwin, count of Flanders, smitten by the charms of Judith, the daughter of Charles the Bold, had carried off the princess, and took refuge with her on his estates. The troops dispatched after the fugitive were routed by the count. The French monarch, distracted by his defeat and the ravishment of his daughter, had recourse to Pope Nicholas, who straightway proceeded to anathematize Baldwin. The ravisher who had braved the armies of a powerful king now trembled in terror before the thunders of the papal throne. He submitted at once to the orders of Nicholas, and proceeded to Rome to appease the apostolic potentate. Having taken particular pains to provide himself with magnificent presents in gold and silver, he was perfectly successful. Melted by the richness of the presents, the pontiff immediately took back all the anathemas he had launched against Baldwin, proclaimed him a faithful son of the Church, and procured his pardon from the French king. Thus, for a large sum of money, Nicholas not only pardoned, but virtually endorsed the ravishment of Judith by the count of Flanders. Indeed, he was always ready to fulminate an execration or to flatter the worst of crimes when-

ever presents or power could be thereby secured. He spent much of his time in excommunicating people far better than himself; in fighting the council of Metz, which he called a conclave of brigands and robbers, and in trying to defend himself against the too truthful accusations of the French bishops.

The following will serve to show the energetic character of letters the Gallican bishops of that day were wont to address to the head of the infallible Church: "Pontiff, you have treated us and our brethren contrary to the rights of nations and the decrees of the Church, and thou hast surpassed in thy conduct thy proudest predecessors. Thy council was composed of inimical monks and priests as debauched and infamous as thyself, and in their presence thou hast dared to pronounce against us a sentence, unjust, rash, and opposed to religion, of which thou pretendest to be chief, to the great scandal of the world. Like a greedy robber, thou hast seized upon the treasures of the Church, thou hast even ravished them from the altar of Jesus Christ: thou murderest Christians; thou snatchest from heaven the valiant and the good to hurl them into the abyss of hell; thou coverest with honey the blade of thy sword, and dost not permit the dead to return to life. Iniquitous and cruel priest, thou hast not but the vestments of a pontiff and the name of a pastor; for under thy sacred ornaments we perceive the sanguinary wolf which rends the flock. Cowardly tyrant, thou bearest the name of the servant of servants, and thou employest treason, gold, and iron to be the Lord of lords; but according to the doctrine of the apostles, thou art the most infamous of the ministers of the temple of God; thus, thy unbridled love of rule will cast thee into the abyss into which thou wouldest precipitate thy brethren. Dost thou think, thou who art born of man, that thou art above a man, and that crime is sanctified because thy hand shall have committed it? No, shameless cockatrice, thou hast become to Christians the venomous serpent which the Jews adored; thou art the dog whom rage pushes on to devour his kind. We dread neither thy venom nor thy bite;

we have resolved, with our brethren, to tear thy sacrilegious decretals, thy impious bulls, and will leave thee to growl forth thy powerless thunders. Thou darest to accuse of impiety those who refuse from love to the faith to submit to thy sacrilegious laws. Thou who createst discord among Christians; thou who violatest evangelical peace, that immortal mark which Christ has placed upon the forehead of his Church; thou, execrable pontiff, who spits upon the book of thy God, thou darest to call us impious! How, then, wilt thou call the clergy, which bends before thy power, those unworthy priests vomited forth from hell, and whose forehead is of wax, their heart of steel, and their sides are formed of the wine of Sodom and Gomorrah! Go to! these ministers are well made to crawl under thy abominable pride, in thy Rome, frightful Babylon, which thou callest the Holy City, eternal and infallible! Go to! thy cohort of priests, soiled with adulteries, incests, rapes, and assassinations, is well worthy to form thy infamous court, for Rome is the residence of demons, and thou, pope, thou art its Satan!"

Reader, remember that this is not the language of enemies of religion, nor of zealots of another faith, but of a body of *Catholic bishops* that thus denounce the city of the Church as the residence of demons, and the successor of St. Peter as its Satan. And yet the Roman Church, as if to honor his arrogance, hypocrisy, his licentiousness and monstrous pride, has placed this pope in the number of the saints. Exactions, injustice, perfidy, and corruption, characterized his ecclesiastical career. He shamelessly set up the blasphemous claim of executing the will of God on earth. And this is a doctrine that is vigorously maintained throughout Catholic Christendom to this day. It is a doctrine the maintenance of which, through the Middle Ages, spread degradation, misery, and slavery over Europe, and gave birth to abominations that surpassed all that was most horrible in antiquity. It is a doctrine which, in our day, caused an imperious council to declare a feeble old man the vicar of God, and to threaten with the curse of heaven princes, potentates, and people who

rejected his infallible rule. Nicholas succeeded in elevating the altar above the throne; and the long line of pontiffs that have succeeded him have made superhuman efforts to eradicate liberty and control the civil and ecclesiastical destinies of mankind.

Nicholas died on the 13th of November, 867.

MAROZIA.

We now enter upon the tenth century, the most deplorable period in the records of Rome. Ignorance, like a cloud, obscured the face of the Church, and monsters unworthy the name of men floated down the stream of the abandoned depravity of the times. The ninth century, as we have seen, was a dark one, a time of division and desolation and debauchery, and one in which corruptions and scandals and abominations filled to the brim the reigns of the pontiffs. The cardinal Baronius, the devoted defender of the infallibility of the holy see, speaks thus of this century: "Never had divisions, civil wars, the persecutions of pagans, heretics, and schismatics, caused the Church to suffer so much as the monsters who installed themselves on the throne of Christ by simony and murders. The Roman Church was transformed into a shameless courtesan, covered with silks and precious stones, which publicly prostituted itself for gold; the palace of the Lateran was become a disgraceful tavern, in which ecclesiastics of all nations disputed with harlots the price of infamy. Never did priests, and especially popes, commit so many adulteries, rapes, incests, robberies, and murders; and never was the ignorance of the clergy so great as during this deplorable period. Christ was then assuredly sleeping a profound sleep in the bottom of his vessel, whilst the winds buffeted it on all sides, and covered it with waves of the sea. And what was more unfortunate still, the disciples of the Lord slept more profoundly than he, and could not awaken him either by their cries or their clamors. Thus the tempest of abomination fastened itself on the Church, and offered to the inspection of men the most horrid spectacle. The canons

of councils, the creed of the apostles, the faith of Nice, the old traditions, the sacred rites, were buried in the abyss of oblivion, and the most unbridled dissoluteness, ferocious despotism, and insatiable ambition usurped their place. Who could call legitimate pontiffs the intruders who seated themselves on the chair of the apostles, and what must have been the cardinals selected by such monsters?"

A splendid spectacle this, as presented by a churchman and a faithful adherent of the Roman see! No wonder that popes and prelates have tried to put out the lights of information, and to efface from the memory of men the actions of their predecessors. But the century upon which we now enter is still worse. Well would it be for Rome could it destroy the records of this age, and prevent the recital of her foulest defilement from being transmitted to posterity. Vice and scandals, crimes and corruption, characterize the reigns of her pontiffs. The Church becomes a place of prostitution, and courtesans dispose of the keys of heaven; incestuous and pedantic priests pollute the steps of the altar, and for the next two centuries fifty popes, apostates, murderers, and wantons will occupy the chair of St. Peter. Platinus, Genebrard, and Stella, in their writings, speak of the pontiffs of the tenth century as simonical priests, magicians, sodomites, tyrants, robbers, and assassins. Says Baronius: "The tenth century should be called the age of iron, on account of the innumerable evils with which it was filled; the age of lead, on account of the tyranny of popes and kings; and the age of obscurity, on account of the sterility of literature and science." And there are people living in this last quarter of the nineteenth century who devoutly believe in the infallibility of the bishops of Rome, and that the chair of St. Peter, the end of all ambition, the recompense of all crimes, the refuge of all abominations, has always been blessed by God; and they believe this notwithstanding these accusations of irreproachable veracity by Catholic historians themselves. Let such read the speech of Edgar, king of England, to the bishops of his kingdom, in the tenth century: "We see in Rome but

debauchery, dissolution, drunkenness, and impurity. The houses of the priests have become the shameful retreats of prostitutes, jugglers, and sodomites; they gamble by night and day in the residence of the pope. Bacchanalian songs, lascivious dances, and the debauchery of a Messalina have taken the place of fasting and prayers. Is it thus, then, infamous priests, that you dissipate the patrimony of the poor, the alms of princes, or rather the price of the blood of Christ?"

Ambition, avarice, and assassination, cupidity and cruelty, craft and corruption, held high carnival in the Church, and iniquity was at its height.

In 905 Sergius III. became the master of the pontifical chair. With him the vindictive spirit and vices of the priest and the insolence of the fanatic were placed on the throne of St. Peter. At this time Rome was ruled by a celebrated courtesan, named Theodora, who had been put in possession of the castle of the city by Adelbert, marquis of Tuscany, her paramour.

The holy city was one vast scene of debauchery, wherein the most powerful families in Italy contended for preëminence. The counts of Tuscany were generally victorious in these contests. And through the power of her noble lover, this female of abandoned character was enabled to sink the throne—which affected to exalt itself above the majesty of monarchs—to the most filthy depths of vice. She had two daughters, whose debaucheries even surpassed her own. The eldest, named Marozia, is the subject of this sketch. Her beauty is said to have been wonderful. She became in her turn the mistress of the marquis of Tuscany, and had by him a son named Alberic. She soon after surrendered herself to pope Sergius. This harlot thus acquired an ascendency at Rome which enabled her to install and depose at her pleasure the pretended heads of the Christian Church, and to place on the throne of St. Peter her lovers, her sons, and grandsons. From this infamous connection with pope Sergius sprang children whom we shall hereafter see became popes in their turn

and who will continue the most monstrous incests with their mother Marozia for three generations. These well authenticated charges are only stated to illustrate the scandalous vices of the times. We would not needlessly exaggerate the shame of the Roman pontiffs.

Sergius continued his disgraceful connection with Marozia during his pontificate; but history leaves us in doubt as to the exact date at which the monster disappeared from the earth, and as to whether he lost the patriarchal throne with his life, or whether he was driven from it by his successor; but it is generally supposed that Christianity lost this champion in 910.

The life of Marozia has no more interest than that of any other vile woman, only as connected with the public affairs of the papacy. Such was her influence, that in 911 she caused the election of Anastasius III., and in 913 that of Lando. In 928 she deposed John X., who had been elected through the influence of her sister and rival, Theodora, and had him put to death, with the assistance of Guido, duke of Tuscany, her second paramour. In 931 she seated in the pontifical chair her son, under the title of John XI. In the following year she united herself with Hugh of Provence, who became king of Italy; but that monarch having struck Alberic, her eldest son, he, out of revenge, roused the Roman youths and massacred the guards of his father-in-law, who sought safety in flight. Marozia died in the castle of San Angelo, where she had been imprisoned. Not being able to make mention of any good of this prostitute or her pontifical paramour, we pass on to the next occupant of the apostolic seat.

JOHN XI.

Disorder and debauchery, impiety and robbery, continued to run riot at Rome. Anarchy and crime covered the countries of Europe from the Bosphorus to the Baltic, from Portugal to the Ural mountains. Degraded women still ruled the Church, and a distaff had been substituted for the sceptre of the popes.

In 931, that infamous Messalina, Marozia, had her young son Octavian—the fruit of her criminal connection with pope Sergius—proclaimed supreme pontiff. Her presents and caresses caused the clergy to place the sacred tiara upon his head, notwithstanding his criminal birth, and that he was but a youth of eighteen. She had made way for his elevation by the murder of John X. This pope had been placed at the head of the Church by Theodora, her sister, likewise a prostitute of the papal court.

The execrable Marozia, becoming tired of her last paramour, had entered into a sacrilegious commerce with John X. He was the son of a nun and a priest, and was a monstrous impersonation of cruelty, lust, and luxury. To revenge herself on him for his illicit intercourse with her mother and sister, she plotted his assassination. Her satellites forced the palace of the Lateran, murdered the brother of the pope, then, binding him with cords, they cast him into prison, where they smothered him between mattresses, towards the end of the year 928. Thus perished a pope who had disgraced the holy see and humanity for sixteen years.

At this time Marozia was in the full splendor of her seductive beauty, and, wishing to continue her control over the affairs of the Church, she became the mistress of her own

son. Then could be seen on the chair of St. Peter a pontiff who only left the abominable arms of his mother to conduct the ceremonies of the Church, and priests and princes bowing in the dust before a shameless harlot, who surpassed in her incestuous licentiousness the most abandoned courtesans of Rome. But tiring, in a short time, of the weakness and irresolution of her son, she sought a more powerful paramour and protector. And so she poisoned her former husband, Guy, and offered her hand and the principality of Rome to king Hugh, his half-brother.

Marozia had a son, named Alberic, the fruit of her incestuous intercourse with the marquis Adelbert, who shared with pope John in the monstrous caresses of their mother. Her husband, Hugh, was one day so far carried away with indignation towards the young prince as to strike him on the face. This outrage so exasperated Alberic that he placed himself at the head of a party of malcontents and attacked the castle of San Angelo. Surprised by the sudden attack, Hugh only saved himself by flight beyond the ramparts. Having become master of the castle, Alberic caused himself to be proclaimed duke of the Romans. He had his brother, Pope John, confined in a close prison, which he was not suffered to leave for the remainder of his life, except to celebrate some service in the great solemnities of the Church, and then he was surrounded by the satellites of Alberic. Debilitated by his debauchery, John XI. lingered in his harsh captivity till 936, when death kindly came to release him.

Marozia still continued to command in the holy city with her vile son. From their criminal intercourse sprang a child, who in his turn was placed on the pontifical throne, and who prolonged the incests of this infamous family to the third generation. And thus is presented the scandalous spectacle of shameless females exercising supreme sway over the holy see, and successively placing among the successors of the prince of the apostles the fruits of their incests and abominable debaucheries.

Historical fidelity demands the statement of these disgrace-

ful facts. Even popish writers are constrained to admit their truth. This short sketch cannot be more appropriately closed than by citing the following forcible language of Cardinal Baronius (one of the most powerful defenders of popery) in reference to the events herein related:

"O! what was then the face of the holy Roman Church! how filthy, when the *vilest and most powerful prostitutes ruled in the court of Rome!* by whose arbitrary sway dioceses were made and unmade, bishops were consecrated, and—which is inexpressibly horrible to be mentioned—*false popes, their paramours, were thrust into the chair of St. Peter*, who, in being numbered as popes, serve no purpose except to fill up the catalogues of the popes of Rome. For who can say that persons thrust into the popedom without any law, by harlots of this sort, were legitimate popes of Rome? In this manner, *lust, supported by secular power, excited to frenzy, in the rage for domination, ruled in all things.*"

Says Mosheim: "The history of the Roman pontiffs that lived in this century is a history of so many monsters, and not of men, and exhibits a horrible series of the most flagetious, tremendous, and complicated crimes, as all writers, even those of the Romish communion, unanimously confess."

Reader, remember that every one of these profligate popes are *holy links* in the chain of "apostolic succession" from St. Peter, the spiritual sovereigns of the *one* true Christian Church, and the vicegerents of God upon earth. In the tenth century the "infallible" heads of the Church of Christ were hirelings of pollution.

JOHN XII.

THE second Agapet was dead. The great Jehovah ran the world alone. The priests and bishops of his holy Church, afraid that God alone would fail to govern the world aright, soon sought another pope. Among the many candidates was young Octavian, son of the incestuous Alberic and grandson of the woman-fiend, Marozia. But eighteen years of age, steeped from his infancy in vice and crime, and inheriting the evil natures of his vile father and his infamous grandmother, he was peculiarly qualified to act as God's vicegerent. Intrigue and cunning soon accomplished his designs, and he was chosen pope. Assuming the name of John XII., he grasped the reins of Roman government. His name was changed, but not his nature.

Uniting in his holy hands the twofold power of God and man, all Italy was crushed beneath his double tyranny; and being backed by powerful relatives, he exercised his power in fiendish fearlessness. Not satisfied with what domain he then possessed, he wished for more, but in his eagerness he lost his all. He coveted the dutchy of Spoleto, and ambitiously essayed to seize it, but was not equal to the task. His forces were defeated, and he was soon compelled to sue for peace. The ruler of Spoleto, ambitious as the pope, now turned the tables, and Rome was in his power. Between his yoke and that of John, the choice was small. The only difference was in the fact that his was foreign.

This subjugation to a foreign power became so odious that the Romans begged the German emperor to free them from the galling yoke.

Otho raised a powerful army and marched to Rome, where

he was received with joy. Pope John, with all the pomp and ceremony of Romish ritual, crowned Otho emperor, and swore, as did the priests and lords and citizens, upon the body of the blessed Peter, that he would ever bend obedient to his rule.

Alas for popish promises! No sooner had the imperial Otho left the holy city than John declared his oath was null and void, and thus absolved himself, his priests and lords and citizens, from their allegiance to the German emperor. Information of this papal perfidy reached Otho ere he crossed the Alps upon his journey home. Returning then to Rome, he called a council of the clergy to try the perjured pope. Evidence was brought which proved that God's vicegerent, John, was guilty of the foulest crimes. He had ordained mere infants, made them priests and bishops to please his concubines; he had been guilty of incestuous intercourse with his aunt and mother, and even Marozia his sensual and libidinous old grandmother, had not escaped his foul embrace; he had, with lavish hand, dispensed the patrimony of the poor among his many courtesans; he had converted the papal palace into a a brothel; he had put out the eyes of priests who had displeased him, and others he had put to death; he had emasculated priests who dared to rival him among his concubines; and could he have invented other crimes he would have added them to his long list of wickednesses. A bishop in the council said: "We declare, my lord, that for a great evil there must be an extraordinary remedy. If this execrable pontiff only injured himself, we should tolerate him, but as his frightful example perverts all Christendom, we beseech you, O magnanimous emperor, to drive this monster from the holy Roman Church, and to place in his stead a man who sets an example of wisdom and virtue." The prince replied, "Be it so." After seven years of pontifical infamy, John XII. was deposed from the see of Rome.

Otho then placed Leo on the papal throne, and thinking Italy entirely pacified, again set out to join his troops in Ombria. But he had scarcely passed the gates of Rome when

new conspiracies were set afoot to reinstate the monster John.

The courtesans and vagabonds of Rome determined to replace their favorite pope upon the throne, and soon recruited, from the thieves and bandits of all Italy, an army strong enough to force the aged Leo to escape from Rome; and John returned in triumph to the Lateran.

He then resumed his former course of crime and infamy. Surrounded by his courtesans and satellites, he launched his bulls of excommunication against the prelates who had favored Leo. This pious agent of the Prince of Peace cut off the hand of John, the cardinal deacon, and the tongue and nose and hand of Ázon, another cardinal.

But John did not enjoy his triumph long. One night a Roman lord surprised him in adultery with his wife, and in his rage he crushed the skull of God's vicegerent. Thus ended one who, for nine long years, disgraced a throne that has disgraced a world. On the twentieth of March, A. D. 964, the world was blessed a moment by the death of John, a model champion of the Christian Church.

POPE JOHN XIII.

After the death of Leo VIII. Otho the Great permitted the Romans to raise to the pontifical see a man of their choice. The bishop of Narni, a Roman, and the son of a bishop, was elevated with one accord to the chair of St. Peter, and consecrated under the name of John XIII. in the year 965.

From the very commencement of his reign, the new pope treated the very first citizens with so much haughtiness that he drew upon himself their enmity, and was driven from Rome. Soon after, in holy retaliation, the pope employed some Calabrian bandits, who assassinated count Rofredus, his avowed enemy, and whom the Romans had made their leader. Then after Otho's entrance to Rome, on the mission of punishing the perfidy of the Romans, hanging a dozen of the principal citizens, and abandoning the prefect Peter to the pontiff, John, instead of interceding for his people, yielded to all his rage against the unfortunate victim who had been given up to him. He cut off the nose and lips of the unfortunate prefect, and caused him to be fastened by his hair to the horse of the equestrian statue of Constantine. By the orders of the pontiff, the executioners defiled his face with unmentionable filth; he was then stripped of his garments and placed backwards on an ass, having small bells attached to its head and sides. In this state he was led on and whipped by the public executioners through all the streets of the city, and cast, all bloody as he was, into a horrible dungeon. The pope then caused the dead body of the count Rofredus, whom he had caused to be assassinated, to be disinterred, as well as that of Stephen, the keeper of the robes. They were trampled under foot in the public place, drawn through the mire, and finally cast into the common sewer. No wonder the

cruelties of the head of the Church alarmed the Gothic emperor, who speedily put an end to these bloody executions.

After this, John seems to have materially desisted from carrying his inherent cruelty into action, and converted this trait of character, by a certain correlation of forces, into the gentle fostering of all manner of silly superstitions. For instance, the chroniclers relate a singular miracle performed on one of the lords in the train of prince Otho, who was possessed of a devil. This unfortunate man, in his paroxysms of fury, tore his face and bit his arms and hands with his teeth. The emperor, deeply grieved by the state of his favorite, ordered that the demoniac should be presented to the pontiff, in order that he might place around his neck the famous chain of St. Peter. The pope placed several chains in succession —made like that of St. Peter's—upon the possessed, yet they produced no effect; but as soon as the true one touched him, a thick smoke issued from the body of the demoniac, frightful cries were heard in the air, and the demon was driven from his residence.

It was this pope who introduced the singular custom of blessing or baptising bells. It is pretended that this usage was anterior to his reign, but we find no trace of it before him. It is laughable to hear one Protestant writer bewailing that it is certain that the Church owes to him this abuse of the most august of its sacraments.

According to some legends, the great bell of St. John in the Lateran (to which this pope gave his name), acquired the spiritual virtue of putting demons to flight when they seized upon the bodies of the faithful. One instance will suffice: "It was at the time of afternoon prayers. A young mother was conducted by her mother to the church, and as they commenced mounting the steps of the porch, the bell sounded to call the Romans to prayer. 'I saw,' said a monk of Monte Casino, 'this poor girl then fall into horrid convulsions, and I perceived the spirit of darkness escape from the extremity of her garments, under the form of a newly born child, which suddenly disappeared.'"

POPE BONIFACE VII.

Benedict VI. had fallen at the hands of Crescentius, a noble and patriotic Roman who, upon the death of Otho, the great Gothic emperor, had conceived the courageous and generous thought of reëstablishing the old Roman republic. Crescentius could not bear the thought, now that the alien emperor was dead, of having his own and his countrymen's glorious Rome domineered over by a mere Christian bishop, whose morals, moreover, were infamous—Roman by birth and son of Hildebrand though he might be. Accordingly, he summoned the citizens to arms, and deliberated with them over the measures necessary to be taken to execute their noble project. All recognized the necessity of overthrowing the new pontiff, who was the creature of the emperor, and that the people might regard themselves as freed from the oath of fidelity which they had taken, they decided to put him to death. In consequence of this, Crescentius, at the head of a troop of soldiers, forced the pontifical palace, seized the person of the pope, led him into the court-yard of the palace and strangled him.

We unhesitatingly approve of and ever applaud the stern republican Crescentius for having delivered Rome from a bad pope, because the bloody execution is entirely justified by the necessity in which the Roman people found themselves of freeing the city from a pontiff who wished to exercise an odious tyranny over it. It was a fine outburst, in those degenerate days, of the grand old spirit of the Roman citizen against the humiliating and unbearable rule of the oppressor.

But mark! Error "crushed to earth, will rise again," as readily as truth. At least it has done so, all along the dim

line of the past. Hitherto, in human affairs, there has been no guarantee whatever, divine, cosmic, or human, that ever the truth comes uppermost, and ever is justice done. The good—individual, social, and natural—has often ere this been blotted out of existence. Eternal human vigilance is the price of righteousness as well as of liberty. In the case before us, incarnate error and iniquity and tyranny reappeared immediately upon the death of Benedict in the person of Boniface VII. On the very spot on which the former was strangled, in the very midst of the cries of death and the noise of arms, a priest, the execrable Francon, dared to proclaim himself sovereign pontiff of Rome. The first thing he did was to trample under foot the dead body of his predecessor. He then hastened to the palace of the Lateran, placed the tiara on his criminal forehead, and was at once duly enthroned, in the year 973.

This vile vicar of Christ was of the basest origin, being the son of a courtesan and a deacon named Ferrutius. Ambitious, audacious, vindictive, and cruel, his life had been one long succession of infamies. He did not, however, long enjoy the fruits of his crimes. The leaders of another party, who were also ambitious of possessing the sovereign power, declared a furious war against him, and pursued him with so much bitterness that he was obliged to flee from Rome. But before quitting the city, he seized the treasures of the church of St. Peter; then, flying like a robber, he soon reached the sea-side, and embarked for Constantinople, where, in order to pay the expenses of his table and support his mistresses, he publicly sold, in the streets of Constantinople, the sacred ornaments, the holy pyxes, the perfume boxes, the chandeliers, and even the crucifixes. Finally, after a period of scandalous and beastly conduct, he dared to return into Italy, in the train of the Greek troops who had taken up arms against Otho II. Here he employed almost every possible dishonorable means, not neglecting simony and murder, in order to remount the pontifical throne. And he succeeded.

After his flight, the Tuscanella party placed on the holy

see the priest Domnus, who did nothing remarkable, and of whose death nothing certain is known, except that he disappeared from the pontifical throne and from history towards the year 974. Did he finish his days in the honors of his office, or was he dethroned by his successor and sent into exile? Some authorities maintain that the wily and unscrupulous Boniface, still smarting under the indignities of his exile, and who had returned into Italy, and was engaged in reassembling his partisans in order to mount upon the throne of the Church, had a hand in dispatching Domnus. Be that as it may, he was yet unable to overcome his competitor, Benedict, bishop of Sutri, who was proclaimed sovereign pontiff still by the Tuscanella party in the year 974. This vile fellow joined the emperor in his horrible butchery of the grandees of Rome—a piece of Machiavelian cruelty to which history can scarcely furnish a parallel. But this produced terrible consequences to them both. Otho was surrounded by the Greeks and Arabs, the allies of the unworthy Boniface, whom he was endeavoring to drive out of Calabria, as he had already done from Apulia. He only escaped death by a disgraceful flight, in a fisherman's boat. As he was endeavoring to gain the deep sea, he was wounded by a poisoned arrow which the implacable Boniface, who fought with the Saracens, himself shot at him, and of which wound he subsequently died. Benedict did not long survive the prince; he also was struck, beyond doubt, by the same hand that had stricken down the emperor, and the pontifical throne once more became vacant.

Six days after the death of Benedict, the bishop of Pavia was chosen pope, and enthroned under the name of John XIV. But our irrepressible Boniface, who was in the environs of Rome, supposing it would be easy to overthrow the new pontiff before he was firmly seated on his see, sent his emissaries everywhere, distributing money to his partisans, and finally got together a troop of bandits, who proclaimed him absolute master of the city. John was arrested in the palace of the Lateran, and cast into the dungeon of

St. Angelo. Boniface then deposed him, and after four months' confinement, condemned him to perish of hunger. By the order of the usurper, the dead body of John was even exposed on the drawbridge of the fortress, so that no one might have doubts about his death, and to intimidate the partisans he might still have, or who were attached to the emperor. No wonder old authors called the subject of our sketch, through derision, Maliface.

After having thus put Pope John to a most cruel and ignominious death, Boniface remounted the throne. He no longer preserved any shadow of moderation in his conduct. Murders, poisonings, judicial assassinations, succeeded each other almost without interruption in the holy city. Friends and enemies alike feared him; the latter because they had opposed his pretensions, the former because their services were to be paid. Even the neutral were put to death because they had not taken sides.

Whilst blood was flowing in a flood through the streets of Rome, the walls of the Lateran palace were reëchoing the obscene songs of his courtesans or minions, until finally, after an abominable reign of eleven months, at the conclusion of a horrible debauch, the seventh Boniface died suddenly, from an attack of apoplexy, according to some, or from the effects of a very violent poison, according to others.

The news, spread through Rome, exciting transports of joy; all the inhabitants, the lords and the priests, crowded to St. Peter. The people, made cruel by cruelty, tore the dead body of the pope from its coffin, disfigured it with blows of the sword and dagger, and finally the hideous corpse was despoiled of its shroud and dragged through the mire to the place at which stood the equestrian statue of the good pagan emperor, Marcus Aurelius, where it was hung up by the feet. During the night some priests detached it, and buried it in haste without the city, to prevent its being cast into the common sewer.

BENEDICT IX.

UNIVERSAL depravity still prevails, and Rome continues to be filled with robbery, adultery, and murder. The same gross superstition and horrible debauchery that made the tenth century a by-word of infamy characterizes the eleventh. Virtue, morality, and civilization seemed to have abandoned the world, and avarice and ambition, pride and pollution, to have usurped their places within the jurisdiction of the Church. According to Beranger, "the Church was a collection of proud, impious, and wicked men, and the apostolic chair had become a seat for demons."

We now proceed to add another name to the disgraceful list of Roman pontiffs. His preëminence in vice makes him a worthy rival of his profligate predecessors. The famous family of Tuscany, by means of money, threats, and intrigue, still controlled the affairs of the holy see. Upon the death of John XIX., in November, 1033, they placed Theophylacus, son of Alberic, count of Tuscany, upon the papal throne, under the name of Benedict IX. This was a boy aged twelve years, the nephew of the two preceeding popes. The life of this vicious youth who soiled the papal chair can only be paralleled by those of the most debauched of the Roman emperors, Heliogabalus, Commodus, or Caligula. He abandoned himself to every species of debauchery, and a carnival of crime reigned at Rome. A celebrated cardinal of the Church, Benno, charges him with having employed witchcraft and enchantments, and of having dealt largely in love-philters in accomplishing his licentious designs. He also gravely asserts that he sacrificed to demons, and assisted at the assemblies of magicians in the woods at night.

This boy Benedict has attained a most disgraceful pre-eminence over all the preceding popes for baseness of reputation. Plunging recklessly into every species of vice and pollution, he became a monster of crime ere he had reached the verge of manhood. Decency forbids the details of his excessive debaucheries. To gratify his licentious propensities, no act was too bad, no expenditure too lavish. All the vileness and villainy that characterized his predecessor seem to have overleaped the graves of the generations to take on personal embodiment in Benedict IX. All that has been related of the worst of the popes might be repeated of him, and yet the whole would not be told.

A voluptuary and a tyrant, a paragon of lust and profligacy, he furnishes the supremest specimen of human depravity that has yet disgraced the annals of a Church sunk in the cesspools of corruption. Tired of their task, the chroniclers of that age sum up the catalogue of his crimes with a few words, declaring that the details of his enormities are too disgusting to narrate. He is known to have committed several murders with his own hand, and to his unparalleled vileness he added acts of wanton cruelty and the most ungovernable fury.

At length the Romans, accustomed as they were to baseness and debauchery, began to view him with public abhorrence. They raised an insurrection and drove him from the city. His powerful alliances, however, enabled him to return, and perhaps he might have much longer continued to pollute the pontificate by his pernicious passions had not new schemes of iniquity turned him in another direction. Becoming enamored of the beautiful daughter of an Italian noble, he demanded her in *marriage*. Her father, ambitious to secure the papal chair for one of his favorites, named Gratianus, consented on condition that Benedict would abdicate the holy office. The father had immense wealth, and Benedict determined to part with the tiara for a pecuniary profit. They settled upon a suitable price, and the patrimony of St. Peter passed into the possession of a peculating priest. This hire-

ling, by his own confession, bought the triple crown, and the blood-stained hands of Benedict consecrated this successor of the apostles by the title of Gregory VI., in 1045.

Benedict betook himself to a private life, in which he rioted without control in all manner of uncleanness. When and how he finished his career is not exactly known. His life may be summed up in the words of one of his successors, Victor III., who describes him as "abandoned to all manner of vice, a successor of Simon the sorcerer, and not of Simon the apostle." The Church, with her characteristic inconsistency, has neglected to place the name of *this* champion in her catalogue of saints.

GREGORY VII.

We now come to the consideration of the career of the most conspicuous character in the history of the Church, under whom the assumptions of the holy see reached their climax. The Roman pontificate in all the splendor of its strength and supremacy is personified in one man—the famous Hildebrand, now reverenced by Catholics as St. Gregory VII. He was the central figure of the eleventh century, and one of the most extraordinary persons whose name has a place on the page of history. He was the representative of a new order of things, the Cæsar of the Church. Under him the papacy reached its height of power, and trampled under foot the princes of the earth. We now enter upon the most glorious age of the Roman Church—the consolidation of priestly power, the crystallization of ecclesiastical caste, the universal acknowledgment of the pope as the King of kings and Lord of lords, the Golden Age of the Church.

This illustrious but infamous man was an Italian by birth. His father was a carpenter at Rome, named Banizon. His mother carried on an incestuous intercourse with her brother, an abbot of a monastery on Mount Aventine. Most of authors affirm that Hildebrand was the fruit of these amours. He was brought up by his uncle, who took great pains with his education. In his fifteenth year he was sent to France to pursue his studies in the celebrated abby of Cluny. After completing his education he went on a visit to the court of Henry the Black, for the purpose of preaching. The most learned bishops of the age left their dioceses to come to listen to his wonderful discourses. His renown became rumored far and wide, and pope Leo IX. invited him into Italy, and attached him to his person in the capacity of counsellor.

At this time the monastery of St. Paul was in a deplorable state. The church was used as a stable, and the convent was filled with courtesans, with whom the monks lived in the most shameless debauchery. This monastery was given to Hildebrand. Affecting great rigidity of morals, he attempted to reform the abuses and expel the women from the convent. But alas for the moral monk, he was himself surprised in criminal intercourse with a handsome serving girl, and his hypocrisy was unmasked. He suddenly revoked the rigor of his discipline, and procured permission from the pope to keep women in the convent because they understood domestic economy better than the brethren.

The successor of Leo, Nicholas, raised Hildebrand to the rank of archdeacon, and conferred upon him great authority over the clergy. All the leisure hours of his life had been passed in the pursuit of knowledge, and his vigorous intellect now began to be filled with grand schemes for advancing the grandeur of the papal government. He had come to Rome to become the master of the Church. But he was acute and politic, and was content to rule in a subordinate position—to be the power behind the papal throne.

Successfully concealing his ambitious designs, he gradually acquired control of the affairs of the Church. He was employed by pope after pope in the capacity of ambassador of the holy see. This privilege of being near the persons of princes and kings gave him great influence and reputation, and permitted him to pursue his gigantic projects with boldness and energy. He was possessed of profound erudition, an inflexibility of will and intrepidity of courage that no obstacle could arrest, and which recoiled neither from treason nor crime.

Popes died, but Hildebrand put others in their places, the creatures of his policy. He was all the time the real pope—the others but his puppets. He became known as the pope-maker. Pontiff succeeded pontiff, but Hildebrand continued immovable, the guide and master of Rome. And so he buried eight popes, the instruments of his policy and the

victims of his ambition. Historians say he poisoned them to pave his way to the pontifical throne.

One day in 1073 the cardinals and other dignitaries assembled in the church of St. Peter to choose a successor to Alexander II., just deceased. Didier of Monte Cassino, Jerome of St. Rufinus, and other venerable prelates, were proposed, but no one thought of elevating to the holy see the son of the incestuous wife of Banizon the carpenter. Gregory was then sixty years old, short and fat, and utterly devoid of exterior gifts. Small, delicate, and unimposing in appearance, his wonderful eyes often terrified the beholder. His soul was great, and nothing could shake the mighty resolves of his vigorous mind. At length a solemn stillness, broken only by the subdued cadences of the choristers who chanted the service, prevailed in the conclave that had met to choose a pope. Suddenly some priests, who had adroitly mingled among the people, shouted, "Hildebrand is pope, St. Peter has chosen him." And then from every part of the vast assembly a cry rang through the edifice and was echoed from the vaulted roof, that Hildebrand was the pope of the people's choice. He had successfully managed the momentous crisis. His tactics had been perfect, and the promptitude and secrecy with which his plans had been carried into effect demonstrated the paramount influence he had acquired.

When the above cry reached his ears, Hildebrand rushed to the pulpit, and by his vehement gesticulations appeared to implore that a restraint might be put upon these passionate and disorderly emotions. But his protests were in vain. The people could not be pacified until the cardinals announced that he was the choice of the conclave. He was at once arrayed in the scarlet robe, crowned with the tiara, enthroned in the papal chair, weeping and reluctant, and presented to the people, amid renewed shouts and acclamations, as Gregory VII. Then the great pope-maker, himself the greatest of his own creations, pronounced over the bended heads of the people his paternal benediction.

A wonderful change in the character and purposes of the

Church succeeded the elevation of Gregory. He had long aspired to rule mankind. As pope, he resolved to assert an absolute power over the conduct of kings and priests, nobles and nations. The grand idea that occupied his comprehensive mind was to establish a terrible theocracy, of which he, as the vicar of Christ, should be the supreme head. He wished to transfer to papal Rome that splendid universal dominion which Rome had lost under the emperors. A flatterer said to him, "What Marius and Cæsar could not effect by torrents of blood, you have accomplished by a word."

His first task was to enforce celibacy among the clergy. He was ambitious to exercise over the bishops and priests of Christendom a power equal to that possessed by an abbot of Cluny over the order subjected to his rule. He denounced the marriage of the priests as impious. He dispatched his legates through the provinces, depriving the pastors of their lawful wives, and changing the clergy into a monastic order. And now all over Europe arose a fearful struggle between the ties of natural affection and the indomitable will of Gregory.

Previous to this period, the secular priests and bishops had married, and lived blamelessly with their families in the enjoyment of conjugal and filial love. They were suddenly declared, by the thunderous decree of Rome, to be polluted and degraded. Children were declared bastards, wives were torn from their devoted husbands, and bishops were branded with shame and ignominy by ruthless monks. The most calamitous consequences followed. Wretched women, degraded and accursed, were driven to despair and suicide. Some of these victims of grief, unable to survive their shame, threw themselves into the flames. The brutal monkish writers exulted over their misfortunes, and the Church consigned their souls to everlasting woe.

Gregory triumphed. Celibacy was made the rule of the Church, and was enforced with the most inflexible rigor. In a council convoked to carry on his fanatical crusade against marriage, Gregory declared that he preferred a concubinary clergy, sodomites, and even incestuous persons, to those who

contracted matrimony. "Marriage," he said, "attaches the clergy to the State in giving them families, and estranges them from the Church, for which they should sacrifice everything." His decree was addressed to the churches of France, Italy, Germany, and England. The French clergy offered the fiercest opposition, and addressed to him this violent letter: "You are an heretic, most holy Father, since you teach an insensate morality, contrary to the words of Christ and the doctrine of the apostle, who said, 'Let him among you, who cannot live in abstinence, marry; for it is better for him to marry than to burn.' As for you, sacrilegious pontiff, whose debaucheries with young monks, and adulteries with the countess Matilda and her mother, are a public scandal, we learn that you would lead priests into your disorders by forcing them to separate from their wives; but we declare to you that we would rather renounce the priesthood than our lawful wives." But Gregory was now panoplied with the power of a universal hierarch, and the married priests had to succumb to the Jupiter of New Rome, before whose thunders trembled the thrones of kings.

Heretofore, Rome had been in subjection to the emperor of Germany. To emancipate her forever and snap asunder all the ancient ties that connected the Church with imperial power, was another grand aim of Gregory. The pope henceforth must be the supreme pontiff of the universe, and the kingdoms and principalities of earth the domain of Rome.

Henry IV. was a weak young emperor, and the revolt of the German princes favored the project of Gregory. He proceeded to prohibit all ecclesiastics from receiving investiture from the emperor, arrogating the rite to himself. He announced himself the sovereign ruler of the ecclesiastical affairs of all nations. Henry IV. rebelled against this claim of the imperious pope. Should he submit, his own dominion would be reduced to a shadow. Henry and Hildebrand stood arrayed against each other in deadly hostility. And now commenced that celebrated contest between the carpenter's

son and the successor of Charlemagne. Woe to whichever is worsted.

The decree of celibacy had been particularly obnoxious to the Germans. The Italian clergy had always been distinguished by their corrupt morals. Prostitutes were not enough for their debaucheries, and they abandoned themselves to the shameful excesses of sodomy; whilst the Germans, on the other hand, passed their lives with the chaste spouse to whom they had attached themselves.

Henry had just put down the revolt of the Saxons; and flushed with victory, surrounded by faithful friends, and sustained by mighty armies, he treated with disdain the decree of the holy Father. He was summoned to Rome. Henry drove away the pope's legates in disgrace, and ordered the bishops of his kingdom to meet in council at Worms to depose the proud pontiff who had excited general hatred against himself. They assembled and proclaimed the deposition of the pope. Conspiracies were formed throughout Germany, and even in Rome, against the iron-willed Hildebrand. The Simonists, the married clergy, and all who had received their investiture from temporal princes, joined in opposition to papal despots. All Europe seemed united to crush this one little old man.

But no danger or combination of circumstances could shake the indomitable resolution of Gregory. He called together a council in the Lateran. He inspired the superstitious assembly by a wonderful omen. With great awe and solemnity an egg was produced on which a serpent was traced in bold relief, recoiling in mortal agony from a shield against which it had vainly struck its fangs. Gregory interpreted the prodigy to the consternation of the clergy. The serpent was the dragon of the Apocalypse; its mortal agony foretold the triumph of the Church. The effect of this spiritual weapon was marvelous. A wild enthusiasm swept through the assembly. And then the thunderbolt of anathema was hurled against Henry; he was excommunicated, and his subjects were absolved from their allegiance to him. Germany

was placed under interdict. A terrible thing was an interdict in those times. It meant that public worship was to cease; that churches were to be closed; that the bells were to be mute; that sacraments were no longer to be administered, and that the curses of the Church would extend even to the dead, to whom the inexorable pontiff, the awful representative of God on earth, refused the shelter of the tomb. The power of the mighty emperor was suddenly gone. It had melted away like mist before the wind. Bishops abandoned him, priests and princes looked on him with abhorrence, and citizens and soldiers shrunk from him as a lost soul. The emperor of Germany was left in a lonely castle on the Rhine with a few armed attendants.

And now the fallen Henry must humble himself at the feet of Hildebrand. He must make a miserable journey over the Alps in mid-winter to abjectly beg forgiveness of the pope of Rome. And so, with his devoted wife, his infant son, and one attendant, and with scarcely sufficient money to pay his expenses, he set out on a journey, the hardships and dangers of which caused even the most experienced mountaineers to tremble. The winter was unusually severe, the Alpine passes were piled with snow, and vast precipices of ice constantly kept death in the way. But on he must go, or his crown was lost forever. The queen and her infant were drawn down the slippery slopes as if in a sled, and the king slid down on his hands and knees. At last, one stinging cold winter morning, the half-frozen emperor came to Canossa, where the pope was enjoying the society of his mistress, the Countess Matilda. Clad in a thin white linen dress, with head uncovered, and his bare feet upon the snow-covered ground, hungry and humiliated, chilled and disheartened, the penitent potentate stood three days in the outer court of the castle, supplicating the superlative honor of kissing the pope's toe.

Finally the heart of Matilda softened toward the royal suppliant. He was admitted to the presence of the papal prostitute, fell on his knees, and implored her merciful inter-

ference. *Her* prayers prevailed, and the tall, majestic form of the German emperor was permitted the privilege of bowing in contrition and terror before the gray-haired, feeble old man who had made monarchs his servants. Henry joyfully subscribed to every condition imposed on him by the haughty Hildebrand, and received his absolution.

Leaving Canossa, Henry was once more surrounded by his German and Lombard chiefs, who, stung by the pride and rigor of the pope, stimulated him to vengeance. He became once more a king. A terrible civil war, nourished by the stratagems of Gregory, awaited him in Germany. The limits of this sketch will not allow a detailed narration of events. Henry was again excommunicated.

The German emperor once more turned his arms against his spiritual foe. Again he crossed the Alps, but not this time as a humiliated and heart-broken penitent. The thunders of Rome had lost their terrors. The defeated forces of Matilda had fled to the strongholds of the Apennines. Henry advanced at the head of his hordes of Germans and Lombards to the gates of the holy city. Gregory fled, and a rival pope was consecrated in St. Peter's by the hands of the emperor. At this critical moment, a Norman force from southern Italy, under Robert Guiscard, hastened to Gregory's defense, and saved him. Henry retreated; and Rome became filled with Infidel Saracens and half-savage Normans. Gregory was released and returned to the palace of the Lateran.

The wild and uncontroilable troops under Guiscard had marked their entry into the city by plunder and violence. The Romans resolved on revenge. A terrible carnage occurred between the citizens and the conquerors. The city was set in flames. Convents and churches, palaces and private dwellings went down in the fearful conflagration, and the maddened Normans committed all the deeds of horror that attend the sack of cities. Gregory surveyed the ruin of Rome, and offered no word of reproof to its destroyers. Gregory soon after retired to Salerno, where he closed his

earthly career on the 20th of May, 1085. As death approached, no thought of the terrible afflictions he had brought on Europe—of the woes and wars he had occasioned, of the ruin and misery he had spread over Italy and Germany, of his deeds of baseness and debauchery, of the seven popes he had poisoned, of his long life of infamy and licentiousness—seems to have disturbed the sweet serenity of his soul. Just before closing his eyes to earth he granted a general absolution to the human race, excepting Henry and his rival pope. His legacy to posterity was the principle that the pope of Rome was the supreme power on earth. His life and his sayings show that he was a great statesman. He was better qualified for a general or an emperor than for a priest or pope. On the throne of St. Peter he displayed the characteristics that celebrated Cæsar or Napoleon, and showed himself worthy to found the empire of the Church on the ruins of the empire of Charlemagne.

He was the true universal bishop, dethroning emperors and trampling upon nations. He was the complete incarnation of spiritual pride and despotism, and deserves a conspicuous place among the world's great conquerors and the champions of the Church.

ADRIAN IV.

Arnold of Brescia, remarkable as a forerunner of the Reformation and assailant of the popes' temporal power, was born about the beginning of the twelfth century, and became a priest in his native city. The fame of Abelard, the great French philosopher, induced him to visit Paris for the purpose of becoming his disciple. Upon his return he opposed the temporal power of the pope and denounced the corruptions of the clergy. Being persecuted in Italy, he returned in 1140 to Abelard, but incurring the enmity of the latter's great antagonist, St. Bernard, he was compelled to seek refuge in Zurich, where he acquired great influence. In 1146, a revolt having taking place in Rome against the temporal authority of the pope, he proceeded to that city, where he soon became exceedingly popular. The pope was soon expelled from Rome, and the Romans obtained a free constitution.

The only Englishman who has occupied the papal throne is Nicholas Breakspeare. He was born about the year 1100 at Langley, near St. Albans, England. Upon arriving at man's estate he proceeded to Paris where he studied with diligence and soon attained great proficiency, especially in theology. Being admitted to the monastery of St. Rufus, in Provence, he distinguished himself so much by his learning and strict observance of the monastic discipline that he was chosen abbot when the office fell vacant. He soon attracted the attention of Pope Eugenius III., who created him cardinal bishop of Alba in 1146, and sent him two years later as his legate to Denmark and Norway, where he remained some years. Soon after his return from this mission, Anastasius.

successor of pope Eugenius, died, and Nicholas Breakspeare was chosen pope.

Elevated to the papal chair in 1154, he assumed the title of Adrian IV., and resolutely prepared to hazard everything to regain the temporal authority lost by his predecessors. Not being strong enough to accomplish his designs by force, he wisely determined to resort to stratagem.

Arnold of Brescia still governed the citizens of Rome by his matchless eloquence. Advised by him, they had elected a senate of fifty-six citizens for the management of their civil affairs, and while still acknowledging the pope as the head of the Church they declined to accept him as their king. Adrian pretended entire satisfaction with the state of affairs: and for nearly a year after his elevation to the holy see, he confined himself to his ecclesiastical duties. But he was only biding his time and laying his plans. By some mischance a cardinal was killed or wounded in some street brawl. Adrian made of this affair a pretext for interference. He laid the blame for this occurence on some of Arnold's friends; and well understanding the superstitious minds of the priest-ridden Romans, he launched a bull of excommunication against the entire population of the holy city, and caused a complete cessation of the offices of the Church. Superstition conquered hatred. Educated as they had been in the belief that the services of the Church were absolutely necessary to insure salvation, the Romans were not prepared for this terrific blow, struck apparently by the very hand of God. Rome was demoralized. The senate lost its prestige and its power. The terror-stricken Romans, on their bended knees, besought the sovereign pontiff to change his stern decree. This was the golden opportunity that Adrian had sought, and he did not let it slip. He bid the trembling wretches choose between the tortures of a never-ending hell and his supremacy in Rome. They yielded. Arnold and his friends were driven forth and Adrian reigned in triumph.

While the changeable Romans were making and breaking rulers, Frederick Barbarossa was besieging the Italian cities

which refused to recognize his authority. He was already on his way to Rome to be crowned by the hand of the pope.

Hoping to find sympathy for their misfortunes and perhaps assistance for their cause in the noble spirit and strong arm of Barbarossa, Arnold and his associates met him on his journey and appealed to him for aid, telling him that their efforts were inspired by the remembrance of the ancient Roman name. But Barbarossa had no sympathy even for heroic and patriotic Romans while they were weak. "Ancient Rome," he contemptuously replied, "and ancient Roman virtue no longer dwell with you, her perfidious and effeminate children, but with us, her hardy and true-hearted sons."

Adrian, fearing that the journey of Barbarosssa was not being made with peaceful intentions, sent a trinity of cardinals to confer with him regarding his coronation and his intentions toward the holy see. Barbarossa received the papal envoys with great honor, and promised entire submission to the sovereignty of the pope. The envoys then represented to the emperor that Arnold was the chief promoter of sedition within the papal domains, and requested his surrender. The emperor finally yielded to the importunities of the legates and meanly gave up the courageous apostle of liberty who had mistakenly sought refuge in his camp. Arnold was at once loaded with chains, hurried to Rome, and condemned by the pope and his cardinals to be burned to death. The sentence was immediately executed, and this brave and noble hero of free thought and liberty was slowly roasted to death to appease the wrath of this vicar of God and champion of Christianity, Adrian.

The only other event of importance that occurred during the reign of this pontiff was his disposal of the kingdom of Ireland. For seven hundred years Ireland has been subject to English rule, and for seven hundred years she has struggled to be free. Irishmen generally are not aware of the real cause of this subjection to the English throne. Religion blinds them to the fact that religion made them slaves and keeps them in servitude. History shows that the transfer of the

Emerald Isle to England's possession was a mere business transaction between a pope of the Catholic Church and Henry II., king of England.

In or about the year 1155, Pope Adrian IV. addressed to Henry II. the following bull:

"Prince, no one doubts, and you yourself admit, that Ireland, as well as all islands which have received the faith of Christ, belongs to the holy see, and that the popes can dispose of them as they see right. As you have engaged to cause this people to submit to the religious and political laws of the Roman Church, and to constrain them to pay to our see a penny a year for each house, we authorize you to subjugate them by all possible means, but always with the express condition that you preserve the rights of the holy see."

Acting upon this hint, the king of England immediately set about taking possession of what—according to the authority of the infallible head of that Church which the majority of Irishmen love so well—was his own property. All who opposed his project were traitors, not only to their God-appointed king, but also to the pope and Church. The word of the pope was the law of God, and the pope had given them and all their possessions to the English sovereign. But there were Irishmen brave enough to defy even the power of God, and they fought for their liberty as only heroes can. The struggle with the English invader was long and bloody, but God was on the stronger side, and Ireland fell. She fell at the feet of that Moloch of nations, the Roman Church. She fell under a double tyranny—the political tyranny of England and the religious tyranny of Rome; and there she still remains. While Rome holds the keys of Ireland's intellect, her brain and muscle will contribute to England's wealth and power. Seven hundred years ago Rome gave Ireland to her conqueror, and Ireland has since perennially sold her mental birthright for a prospective and visionary mess of heavenly pottage.

During a reign of five years Adrian was constantly increasing his treasures. His avarice was so sordid that he con-

stantly refused to send the least aid to his relatives at Canterbury, preferring that they should live by alms and the charity of the parish priest, rather than see his purse diminish.

The death of this pontiff took place on the first day of September, 1159, in the city of Anaginna. His remains were transported to Rome, and deposited in the church of St. Peter.

ST. DOMINIC.

We now enter upon the consideration of the career and character of a man—of a Christian *saint*—in whom not *one* solitary speck of goodness can be discovered. The few traits of character which can be gleaned from the lying and glozing volumes of his biographers are all of the darkest colors. For nearly all the personal facts concerning him we are indebted to Dominican historians themselves, every one of whose books have been authorized by the Inquisition.

St. Dominic has become famous (or infamous) in history, from the fact that he was the inventor, or the first inquisitor-general of the horrible tribunal called the Holy Inquisition. It is certain that if he was not the inventor, he at least laid the foundation of that terrible institution by which the conscience of mankind was held in bondage for centuries; whose ghastly grasp was fiercely fastened upon the bleeding throat of Europe through centuries of tears and torture; whose gloomy dungeons and hellish machinery of cruelty formed for ages the chief bulwarks of the aggressive career of the Church far as the worship of Mary extended, from Rome to Mexico, from Peru to Japan.

> "Inquisition, model most complete
> Of perfect wickedness, where deeds were done—
> Deeds! let them ne'er be named—and set and planned
> Deliberately, and with most musing pains,
> How to extremest thrill of agony,
> The flesh and blood, and souls of men,
> Her victims, might be wrought; and when she saw
> New tortures to her laboring fancies born,
> She leaped for joy, and made great haste to try
> Their force, well pleased to hear a deeper groan."

For more than six centuries this savage establishment awakened the wonder and horror of mankind. Its one great object was to search out and extirpate Infidels, Jews, and heretics, and thereby preserve the faithful from the contagion of error. Hallowed by the approval of a series of infallible popes, consecrated by the voice of heaven, it pursued a career of vindictive triumph in every land infected by the elements of progress and reform.

Louis de Paramo, one of the most brilliant luminaries of the Church, positively asserts that God was the first instituter of the holy office, and that the first exercise of its power was against Adam. He discovered that the words, "Adam, where art thou?" were a citation before the tribunal; that the garments of skins which God made for the first pair were the model of the *san-benito* which the inquisitors required to be worn by heretics, and that the inhabitants of Sodom were formally burnt for the crime of heresy. He holds that Jesus Christ was the first inquisitor of the new law; that the popes were inquisitors by divine right, and that they afterwards communicated this power to St. Dominic.

This saint was born of a noble family in Calahorra in Spain, 1170. His real name was de Guzman. From early youth he practiced a rigorous asceticism that prepared him for his supernatural mission. He passed days and nights in prayers and penitential tears; he slept on the bare floor, and his body became emaciated by abstinence. He became a diligent student of rhetoric and philosophy at the university of Salamanca. His fervid eloquence, set off by his flashing eyes, his haggard face and wasted figure, soon awoke the attention of the age.

We get accounts of the ardent young priest, together with Diego de Azebes, in the year 1208, in the south of France, endeavoring to convert the Albigenses by his preaching. At this time heresy threatened the downfall of the Church. The pope had come to be considered the Italian Antichrist. A widespread heresy had sprung up in Italy and France; churches were abandoned in many cities, and people were

proclaiming the vices of the priests and the cruel ambition of the court of Rome. Dominic considered himself commissioned to revive the decaying supremacy of the papacy. Gifted with extraordinary talents and eloquence, clad in a black cloak, austere and fanatical, he appeared miraculously fitted for fulfilling his mission. For the purpose of accelerating the effect of his sermons, he founded a new order of preaching friars that rapidly multiplied under his care, and wandered over Europe, the champions of the virgin and the former glory of the Church.

In the twelfth century the Albigenses possessed the sunny fields of Provence. They were refined, industrious people, happy in their peaceful homes of contented labor. Their cultivated farms smiled amidst a world of barbarism and Christian malignity. Here, under the mild rule of the counts of Toulouse, people of all shades of faith lived in the luxury of unbounded liberty of conscience. Theirs was the home of the troubadours and of early European civilization. Here they cultivated a literature of romance and song that afterwards gave rise to the genius of Dante and Petrarch. But they were heretics. They scoffed at the polluted priesthood, and defied the tyranny of Rome. They proclaimed universal toleration, and welcomed the hated Jews to their industrious cities. Their dangerous doctrines began to spread over Europe. Dominic came among them, but his fanatical exhortations had no effect upon these stubborn heretics. Wholesome medicinal pain and persecution alone would effect their conversion and rescue their souls.

And now commenced that struggle for spiritual freedom, which, continued by Wickliffe, Huss, and the Huguenots, after a contest of seven centuries ended only by the overthrow of papal supremacy by the successful arms of Victor Emanuel. The order of Black Friars, or Dominicans as they came to be called, was instituted at Toulouse.

At the instigation of the intolerant Dominic, Innocent III. preached a crusade against the Albigenses in 1208. The fair fields of Provence, its gay and wealthy cities, were plun-

dered and laid waste by papal persecutors. The zeal of Dominic secured his appointment as inquisitor-general, and the regard and favor of Simon, Count de Montfort. A large part of the population of Provence perished by famine or the sword, and a dreadful gloom of barbarism and decay settled upon the south of France. The Albigenses sunk before the vindictive rigor of Rome; the Inquisition pursued them into their most secret retreats, penetrated their family circles, planted spies in their daily path, patrolled the ruined cities, and visited the vengeance of the Church upon even the dead.

Under the auspices of St. Madelaine, Count Montfort took the city of Beziers by assault, and put all the inhabitants to the sword. At Loval four hundred Albigenses were burnt at once.

"In all the histories of the Inquisition that I ever read," says Paramo, "I never met with an act of faith so eminent, or a spectacle so solemn." At the village of Cazera sixty were burnt, and in another place one hundred and eighty. Wherever the Dominicans passed, they left behind them a track of desolation. The pious and the good were racked by fatal tortures, and burnt alive in their homes, the victims of the moloch of Rome.

The Dominican friars wore a white garment with a black cloak and a pointed black cape. Whenever they passed through the streets every door was closed and barred, and the affrighted people with their trembling families hid from the face of day. A solemn gloom settled upon every town which they entered. A reward of a mark of silver was offered to any one who denounced a heretic. Every house that had sheltered the Albigenses was razed to the ground; every cave or lonely cottage in which the fugitives might find a refuge was carefully sought for and destroyed; and the spirit and genius of Dominic swept over the south of France like a storm of religious frenzy. The Inquisition triumphed. It extirpated heresy, and the last traces of classic civilization in the country of the Albigenses, strangled industry and liberty,

and upon the blood-stained ruins of happy homes established the supremacy of the Pope. Dominic died in 1233. It would have been a happy thing for mankind had his order died with him. He was canonized by Gregory IX. in 1233.

In 1224 another Dominican order was established, called the "Knights of Christ." Its object was to suppress heresy by force of arms. The original order increased rapidly in numbers and influence. In England they were always called the "Black Friars," and many traces of them are to be observed in nearly every town. In France they were called Jacobins, from the fact that they first located themselves in the Rue St. Jacques, Paris.

They produced many famous scholars, among whom may be named the "Angelic Doctor," the famous Thomas Aquinas. Their great rivals were the Franciscans.

At the present day, the order of Dominicans flourishes chiefly in Hungary, France, Switzerland, Belgium, and America. The Inquisition was adopted by the count of Toulouse in 1229, and confided to the Dominicans by Pope Gregory IX. in 1233. Innocent IV. in 1251, established it in the whole of Italy, with the exception of Naples. At the commencement, heretics in Milan were not subject to death; but soon they were burnt at Milan, as well as in the other parts of Italy; and Paramo, inquisitor in the kingdom of Sicily, asserts that in 1315 some thousands of heretics spread themselves through Cremasco, a small territory included in the jurisdiction of the Milanese. The Dominican brothers burnt the greater part of them, and thus checked the theological pestilence by the flames. The first canon of the Council of Toulouse enjoined the bishops to appoint in every parish a priest and two or three laymen of reputation, who should be bound by oath to search carefully and frequently for heretics, in houses, caves, and all places where they might be able to hide themselves, and to give the speediest information to the bishop, the seigneur of the place, or his bailiff, and to take all necessary precautions against the escape of any heretics discovered. In 1473 Sixtus IV. made the inquisitions independ-

ent and separate from the tribunals of the bishops. He created for Spain an inquisitor-general, with full powers to nominate particular inquisitors; and Ferdinand V., in 1478, founded and endowed the Inquisition. We learn from well authenticated history, that in seventeen years alone, from 1481 to 1498, Torquemada, the inquisitor-general of Spain, sent 97,371 men and women to the gallows; burned alive 10,220, and killed in secret dungeons 4,000 victims.

Nowhere in the annals of cruelty and horror can more dreadful events be discovered than those relating to this terrible tribunal. The torture and destruction of life inflicted on the race through the agency of the Holy Office, by such monsters as Torquemada, Diego Deza, and Alva, simply because of a diversity of belief in matters of faith, fully verifies the remark of the pagan in the fourth century who declared there were no wild beasts so ferocious as the Christians. It is beyond the power of the pen to portray the misery mankind have suffered from the Inquisition—the Inquisition, which exhumed the dead in order to burn them as heretics, and which has burned at the stake five millions of men.

The proceedings of the Inquisition begin by a denunciation. This is soon changed to a declaration. The accused is asked, in general terms, if he or she has ever heard anything which was, or appeared to be contrary to the Catholic faith, or the rights of the Inquisition. If suspected of heresy, the accuser had to state whether it was slight, grave, or violent. The laws of the Holy Office were always the same. The "Black Book"—a large manuscript volume in folio—contained the method of conducting a process, which was never varied. It was called the "Black Book," because it was covered with that color, or, as an inquisitor explained it, is "Libro Necro," the book of the dead. In this book of death, the code of crime, the mode of accusing, and the punishment for every supposed offense is minutely given. The following astounding passage is from the "Libro Necro:" "With respect to the examination, and the duty of examiners: either the prisoner confesses, and he is found guilty from his confes-

sion, or he does not confess, and is equally guilty on the evidence of the witness. If a prisoner confesses the whole guilt of which he is accused, he is unquestionably guilty of the whole; but if he confesses only a part, he ought still to be regarded as guilty of the whole; since what he has confessed proves him to be capable of the guilt as to the other points of accusation. And here the precept is to be kept in view, 'No one is obliged to condemn himself,'—*Nemo teneter prodere scipsum.* Nevertheless, the judge should do all in his power to induce the culprit to confess, since confession lends to the glory of God. And as the respect due to the glory of God requires that no one particular should be omitted, not even a mere attempt, so the judge is bound to put in force, not only the ordinary means which the Inquisition affords, but whatever may enter into his thoughts, as fitting to lead to a confession.

"Bodily torture has ever been found the most salutary and efficient means of leading to spiritual repentance. Therefore, the choice of the most befitting torture is left to the judge of the Inquisition, who determines according to the age, the sex, and the constitution of the party. He will be prudent in its use, always being mindful, at the same time, to procure what is required from it—the confession of the delinquent. If, notwithstanding all the means employed, the unfortunate wretch still denies his guilt, he is to be considered as a victim of the devil; and, as such, deserves no compassion from the servants of God, nor the pity or indulgence of holy Mother Church; he is a son of perdition. Let him perish, then, among the damned, and let his place be no longer among the living." Ludovicus derives the example of confiscating the property of heretics from God himself: "For," says he, "God, as the first inquisitor, teaches other inquisitors—his delegates —how heretics should be dealt with."

The tortures generally used upon the victims were the pulley, the fire or chafing dish, the rack, and the trouth, in which the prisoner was bound and corded. Among the punishments for blasphemy against God, the Virgin, the

saints, or the pope, there was an instrument used called "mordaccia, or bit," which was a contrivance to confine the tongue, and compress it between two cylinders of wood and iron, and furnished with spikes. This instrument not only wounds the tongue and creates intense pain, but it often so swells it as to cause the victim danger from suffocation. Every possible variety of ingenious cruelty has been practiced by the Inquisition to torture and agonize its victims. To illustrate the workings of the Inquisition in the eighteenth century the following cases are cited: Elizabeth Vasconcellas, the daughter of John Chaffer, of Devon, England, a Protestant, was taken to Madeira upon a family misfortune, and under the auspices of the English residents, continued to live in her own faith for eight years. In 1704, while her husband was in Brazil, she was taken seriously ill, and while in an unconscious state she was visited by a Romish priest, who administered the sacraments, and on her recovering was desired to attach herself to that faith. She absolutely refused, for which she was imprisoned by the bishop of the island seven months for holding heretical sentiments. She was then removed to the Inquisition at Lisbon, in December, 1705. An inventory of all her effects was then taken in the prison of the Holy Office, and her person searched. She was made to swear this was all she was worth, and then was taken to her cell, where she was kept for nine months and fifteen days. The first nine days she was allowed only bread and water and a wet straw bed. On the ninth day she was questioned on her religious faith, and she declared herself a Protestant. They told her she must conform to the Romish faith or be burnt. In a month's time she was again summoned before the Fathers and questioned, but without inducing her to recant. The officials stripped her back, and after lashing her with knotted cords, told her to kneel down and thank the court for their mercy, which she refused to do. In fifteen days she was again brought forward, and a crucifix set before her, which she was commanded to bow down and adore; and refusing to do this, she was told she must expect

to be burnt with the Jews at the next *auto da fé*. At the expiration of thirty days, she was again called before the judges. Her breast was laid bare by the executioner, who, with one end of a hot iron rod, burnt her to the bone in three different places on her right side, and she was sent back to her cell without any application to heal her sores. At a subsequent audience she was asked whether she would profess the Romish faith or burn. She replied she was a Protestant and a subject of the queen of England. To this the inquisitor told her that being an English subject signified nothing in the king of Portugal's dominions; that the English in Lisbon were heretics and would certainly be damned. The executioner was then ordered to seat her in a chair, and to bind her arms and legs, so as to prevent even motion. A physician was at hand to decide how far she could be tortured without hazard of life. Her left foot was put into an iron slipper, made red hot, and fastened there, until the flesh was burned to the bone. She fainted under this torture, and the physician advised the slipper to be taken off, and she was sent to her dungeon. After some time elapsed she was again cruelly whipped, and her back torn all over, and was threatened with greater severity if she did not embrace the Romish faith. On the other hand, liberty was promised, if she would change her religion. She finally consented, and wrote her name to a paper, though she knew not what it contained. And then, without returning to her her goods and money, they dismissed her, destitute, and dependent upon the charities of the people of Lisbon.

The following is from a letter written by Mr. Wilcox (afterwards bishop of Rochester) from Lisbon to Gilbert Burnet, the historian of the Reformation, dated June 15, 1706. "I saw the whole process of an *auto da fé*. Of the five condemned, four were burnt. Heytor Dias and Maria Pinteyra were burnt alive, and the other two were strangled. The woman was half an hour alive in the flames—the man about an hour. They were fastened to a pole, six feet higher than the fagots. The wind being a little fresh, the man's back

was perfectly wasted, and as he turned himself, his ribs opened before he left speaking, the fire being recruited as he roasted, to keep him in just the same heat; but all his entreaties would not procure him a larger allowance of wood to shorten his misery and dispatch him."

Archibald Bower, one of the inquisitors of the Inquisition, made his escape in 1726. The following is taken from his statements: "There was an anvil fixed in the middle of the floor, with a spike, not very sharp, projecting upwards. The accused was hoisted up and lowered by ropes at the four corners of the room until his back-bone rested on a spike. The weight of his body tended to fracture his spine. This torture lasted eleven hours, unless the prisoner confessed. Matches of tow and pitch were wrapped around the hands of women, and then fired until their hands were consumed; or cords were tied so tightly around the thumbs as to cause the blood to flow from the nails." A manuscript was put into his hands giving him directions for applying the torture. It was so barbarous and inhuman that it was not in print, but each member possessed a copy, which is handed back to the inquisitor-general upon the death or serious indisposition of a councilor, with the seal of the Inquisition on it; after which it was death to any one to open or retain it.

Bower fainted once upon witnessing the torture of prisoners, and was severely reproved. He extenuated himself by ascribing it to nature. "Nature," said the inquisitor; "you must conquer nature by grace." To conquer nature, the inquisitor-general ordered him to arrest an intimate friend, who was a nobleman. Bower could devise no means to save his friend, and had to proceed with the guards to his house. He knocked: the maid servant inquired who was there. The answer was, "The holy Inquisition; come down and open the door without any noise, on pain of excommunication." The girl came instantly, and showed the way to her master's room. The lady awoke first and shrieked, when one of the ruffians gave her a blow on her head, which caused the blood to flow. The nobleman was astonished to find himself arrested by his

best friend, but made no reproach. Bower, next morning, announced the arrest to the inquisitor-general, thus: "This is done like one who is desirous to conquer the weakness of nature." The nobleman underwent the tortures of the pulleys and died in three days. His estate was confiscated to the Holy Office, a small pension being allowed the widow.

Llorente states, that when the Inquisition was opened in Spain, in 1820, twenty prisoners were found who did not know the name of the city in which they were; not one knew the nature of the crime of which he was accused. One of these prisoners had been doomed to suffer death the following day. His execution was to have been by the "pendulum." The condemned by this process is fastened on his back, in a groove to a table; suspended above him is a pendulum, with a sharp edge, and so constructed as to become sharper every moment. The victim saw this coming nearer and nearer every moment; at length it cut the skin of his nose, and gradually cut on, until life was extinct. This was the invention of the inquisitors to dispose of their victims at a time when they were afraid to celebrate their *auto da fé*.

A late writer speaks thus of the terrible Inquisition, with its dread "familiars," its racks, pullies, and horrid instruments of cruelty: "In imagination, one can enter the gloomy 'hall of torture,' and in the dim lights see the malignant judges of that infernal court; see the rack and the waiting executioner. Look again, and oh! the fearful scene! See one of the softer sex, a woman, young, and once beautiful, but now naked—yes, actually naked—stretched out in dire agony, with dislocated limbs, bleeding and fainting before men! Men? No! but before fiends in human shape, called inquisitors. There they sit, or recline, with their books and crosses, and with the stolid indifference of the veriest savages. Alas! alas! no soothing voice can ever more be heard; no word of comfort spoken in that dolorous hour; no tender human heart throbs with sympathy for that poor victim; no eye is dimmed with pity for so much human suffering; no ear is pained to hear the death groans of that delicate girl, guilty

most likely of no offense save that of having, perhaps, spoken lightly of some suspicious priest or of some absurd rite of the Church. The dew of death is upon her brow; her parted lips are reddened with her own life-blood: her clotted hair, her bruised body, her broken limbs, elicit no word of remorse for her agony. Alone and unresisting, she is in the hands of her brutal persecutors; the muffled walls conduct no sound of her distress to the outward world, it is shut out to her forever. The icy hand of the last deliverer is now upon her, but the actual stare of death is less terrible to her closing eyes and fading vision than the sound of the accursed monsters who sit before her—the clerical monsters of the holy order of St. Dominic.

"It is a gala day in Madrid; it is the Christian Sabbath. The pious who have attended church are moving toward the massive, gloomy building of the Inquisition. The Spanish king and his courtiers are sitting on an elevated stage which is richly carpeted, and the royal person is shaded by a silken canopy. There are also to be seen familiars and grandees from Cordova and from other cities. Bishops in rich robes are in conspicuous positions, and great numbers of priests, monks, and friars attest that there is to be a ceremony of some kind in which the Church is greatly interested. The sunbeams flash upon the mitres and crosses of the ecclesiastics, and upon the swords and spears and other military weapons of the armed missionaries of the 'True Faith.' All present seem to be in a state of excited expectation. But hark! a bell tolls—it has been tolling since the early dawn. It cannot be the call for an imposing religious ceremony: no, 'tis a death knell, the knell for another dread act of religious persecution. See! There is now a movement in the vast crowd in front of the Inquisition; its heavy gate—like the gates of hell—yawn wide, and a procession, as if intended to represent an egress of the spirits of the damned, moves slowly out. Dominican friars—called pious men—are in advance, bearing the repulsive banner of the 'Holy Inquisition;' penitents, or those who had been terrified into compliance, follow;

and then follow the bare-footed, sad, and long array of those who are destined for the flames. Some, with pallid faces, are wounded and limping: some are too weak and emaciated to walk, and these, with others whose bones have been broken and whose flesh has been mangled by the torture, are rudely borne toward the guarded space in front of the majesty, the episcopacy, and the nobility of Spain, and in the midst of the fanatical crowd whose eyes are hungry for a fresh scene of torture. The condemned are clad in the yellow *San-benito*, disfigured with infernal effigies; each wears the *coroza*, or pointed cap of infamy, and holds an extinguished torch; and each is attended by a Jesuit who hurls reproaches, instead of offering a word of pity or a prayer for mercy. They have now reached the great cross erected in the field of the Cruz del Quemadaro, the place of execution: the sentence is read, a blow is given to each of the condemned by one of the clerical officers of the Inquisition, and the accused are delivered over to the secular power. A feeble, formal, hypocritical plea in their behalf is muttered by a priest—a vile deceit, for stakes are fixed, and fuel is ready, and the condemned are chained and weeping. There is no offering of mercy in reply to that plea, for the Christian king ostentatiously sends his gilded and adorned fagot to be added to the pile. Oh horror! The flames ascend: a hundred human beings are shrieking and groaning and writhing in torture. The surrounding multitude are delighted, and thanks to God are given by the king, by the priests, and by the people for this triumph of the True Faith, for the extirpation of so much heresy, and for the terrible spectacle of another *auto da fé*."

Dominic had passed away; but his machinery of malice was put in operation throughout Christendom, and his savage spirit ruled the Church like the genius of human woe. No war or pestilence ever inflicted more misery on mankind. Bonfires lighted every town, and liberty and genius lay chained in the Inquisition.

"The sword of the Church was unsheathed, and the world was at the mercy of ignorant and infuriated priests, whose

eyes feasted upon the agonies they inflicted. Acting, as they believed, or pretended to believe, under the command of God, stimulated by the hope of infinite reward in another world—hating heretics with every drop of their bestial blood, savage beyond description, merciless beyond conception—these infamous priests, in a kind of frenzied joy, leaped upon the helpless victims of their rage. They crushed their bones in iron boots, tore their quivering flesh with iron hooks and pincers, cut off their lips and eyelids, pulled out their nails and into the bleeding quick thrust needles, tore out their tongues, extinguished their eyes, stretched them upon racks, flayed them alive, crucified them with their head downward, exposed them to wild beasts, burned them at the stake, mocked their cries and groans, ravished their wives, robbed their children, and then prayed God to finish the holy work in hell."

From the time when the Black Friars of Dominic searched the streets of the cities of Provence by night, and dragged its horrified heretics to their terrible tribunal, the holy Inquisition constantly advanced in power until it became the perfection of cruelty and tyranny. We cannot pause to dwell upon the diabolical wisdom of its government, nor upon the variety and the curious originality of its implements of torture. For ages the ingenuity of meditative monks were tasked to its utmost in inventing wonderful instruments for twisting joints and stretching sinews, heavy weights for crushing the bodies of their victims, thumbscrews and pulleys and racks cunningly calculated to give mankind a foretaste of the torments of hell.

Want of space forbids us to follow the miserable march of the institution of Dominic through the Old World and the New. It would be the same unvarying tale of crime and torture. It breathed the blight of decay over every land to which it found its way. It made a dreary waste of provinces that once laughed with plenty, and desolated ruins of cities once renowned for opulence and grandeur. It continued its career of cruelty and crime till the beginning of the eighteenth

century. It then began to decline. The fatal shafts of free thought and a free press were aimed at the infamous tribunal. The Holy Office began to sense the abhorrence of mankind. Inquisitors and holy houses were swept like chaff before the omnipotent stride of that gigantic Nemesis, Napoleon. Spain and Italy were obliged to abandon the horrid orgies of the chamber of torture. Science had long enough lamented the fate of Bruno and Galileo. The people swore that it must be swept from the path of progress. The Germans crossed the Rhine and marched victoriously within the walls of Paris. The holy Father on the throne of St. Peter was left without a friend, and had to yield his temporal crown. Italian troops and exiled patriots poured into the Eternal City. United Italy was free, and a boundless joy swelled over the world. The Inquisition of Dominic that had brooded like a terrible nightmare over Europe since the destruction of the Albigenses had ceased to exist.

"Yet the sacred duty will ever remain for us and for posterity to celebrate with gratitude and admiration the memory of the countless hosts who perished by the fires of persecution; of those generous martyrs who fell in the front ranks of human advance. The gentle Albigenses, gifted children of the South; the Spanish Hebrew, teacher of industry and thrift; the Moors, adorned by scholarship and taste: the Lutheran and the Calvinist; the men of science, philosophy, and thought—the honored list of the victims of Dominic and the Inquisition—must shine forever with a softened lustre amidst the gloom of the Middle Ages; and it is possible that some historians from the declivities of the Rocky Mountains or the shores of the Pacific, when, six hundred years from now, according to the limitation of Cicero, he studies the annals of European barbarism, will neglect the useless strife of savage kings and persecuting priest to record the fate of the inventors and artisans, the laborers and thinkers, who laid in suffering and toil the foundations of modern freedom."

INNOCENT III.

THE proper name of this pope was Lotharius. He was the son of a Roman count named Trasimund, and was born in Rome in 1161. He succeeded Celestin III. in the pontifical chair in 1198. He was characterized by great resolution and austerity, and sought by every means to establish the supremacy of the papal power. He placed the kingdom of France under interdict in 1199 because the king, Philip Augustus, had repudiated his wife, and thus he compelled him to re-instate her. About 1200 he instigated the fourth crusade, which resulted in the capture of Constantinople. In 1212 he excommunicated and dethroned Otho, emperor of Germany, and crowned Frederic of Sicily in his place. A memorable quarrel occurred between this pontiff and king John of England, in 1207, respecting the archbishop of Canterbury, the right to appoint being obstinately claimed by each. Innocent improved the flattering opportunity which crime and misfortune had presented in rendering John unpopular with his subjects, to provoke a collision with him for the purpose of furthering the papal designs. The see of Canterbury having become vacant, Innocent appointed Cardinal Langston to fill the vacancy. John resisted this act as an unjustifiable encroachment on the prerogatives of the crown. The pope proceeded to exercise his spiritual functions by laying England under an interdict. This meant that he suspended the performance of religious worship in the king's dominions, excommunicated him, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance to him. The consequence of this was the wildest disorders among the people. Anarchy took the place of law; the army refused to obey the king's orders: his friends

deserted him; and he soon found himself without domestics, without alliances, and without the means of resistance. The pope, who, let it be remembered, claimed a right to all the world by virtue of his holy office of God's vicegerent on earth, now graciously proposed to mitigate the misfortunes of the king and to restore him to his former authority if he would cede his kingdom to the see of Rome, and consent to rule it as a vassal of the pope. The king was compelled to submit unconditionally to the terms of the sacerdotal despot. Thus the temporal jurisdiction of the pope was established over England and Ireland, and the title is still mentioned by the holy see as valid and indisputable. Violent conflicts afterwards arose between John and his subjects, and in order to save his crown he had to yield to the powerful barons at Runnymede the act of Magna Charta. And now the pope, the natural foe of all constitutional guarantees of popular right and liberty, interposed in behalf of the imbecile sovereign, and absolved him from all obligations to comply with the concessions he had made. He declared the Magna Charta antagonistical to the Catholic religion, forbade the king to observe any of its provisions, and pronounced sentence of excommunication on all who should obey or attempt to enforce the heretical act. The English king became a mere puppet moved by the papal machinery. He was placed at the head of a formidable foreign army and set to butchering his subjects. He carried terror and devastation through his dominions, until every city, village, and house was distracted with alarm. At last, however, the design of the pope was defeated by Philip of France accepting the crown from the barons, and becoming sovereign of England. Innocent, like all the other heads of the Catholic Church, assumed the right to bring all governments, by fair or foul means, under his absolute authority. During his pontificate the papal power attained its greatest height.

In 1214 he raised a cruel persecution or crusade against the Albigenses for heresy. This was a religious sect inhabiting Narbonne and several other provinces of the south of

France. They rejected the external rites of the Romish Church, except baptism and the Lord's supper. They disavowed all faith in images, indulgences, and such other semi-pagan mummeries. They rejected as impious auricular confession and the forgiveness of sins by man. They demolished such nunneries as were in existence among them, and looking upon the pope as the "Man of Sin," they scouted the idea of his temporal jurisdiction over the nations of the earth. These crimes, of course, were not long overlooked by Innocent III. He denounced them as heretics, and determined that they should be exterminated. He sent two spies amongst them, of the names of Guy and Regnier. These were monks, whose hands were already stained with blood. They were empowered by the pope to use their own discretion in checking the heresy of the Albigenses by fire, sword, fagot, or the Inquisition, which employed all these means upon such occasions. Innocent preached a crusade against them, and published a bull addressed to all the authorities of southern France, declaring them accursed and excommunicated. He granted absolution to all who should murder them and take possession of their property. The crusade against this unfortunate people commenced in 1209. Indulgences were offered to all who would engage in the war. By these means he succeeded in raising an army of five thousand men, mainly composed of monks and pious papists. This army was increased by multitudes of peasants, armed with scythes and clubs, which, under the command of monks, were commissioned to murder the wives and children of these heretics, while their husbands and fathers were engaged in the field with the "holy army." The sufferings of the Albigenses were cruel beyond description. When papal troops arrived at a place called Beziers, the citizens were, of course, alarmed. The pope's legate sent many messengers among them, advising them to give up such heretics, with their wives and children, as continued obstinate among them. They replied as follows: "*Rather than be base enough to do what is required of us, and abandon our religious principles, we will eat our children first, and our wives will die*

with us." On receiving this answer, the pope's army, like incarnate devils, rushed upon them so suddenly, and in such numbers, that they had to surrender after little or no resistance. Some of the pope's army entertained scruples as to what should be done to those who were not hereties and happened to fall into their hands: they consulted the legate. The answer was: "Kill them all; the Lord will know his own!" At this answer, the bells rung, by order of this legate, and never ceased to toll until fifteen thousand were butchered upon the spot, according to the account given by the legate himself: although a contemporary historian, named Bernard Itier, and much better authority than this blood-thirsty legate, informs us that thirty-eight thousand were slaughtered in cold blood. After the slaughter at Beziers, Count Simon de Montfort became the leader of the "holy army," and the beloved avenger of the Church. Some of his atrocious proceedings are thus recorded by Catholic authors: "He took several castles which resisted the holy Church, and hanged of good right many of their inhabitants upon gibbets, which they had well merited." Referring to another place, the historian says: "The besieged, wearied out with a long siege, having fled during the night, were stopped by our guards, who cut the throats of as many as they could find." And of another place, the historian continues: "The Count Simon, having taken the castle, caused Aimery, a notable nobleman, to be hanged upon a gibbet, also a number of knights. The other nobles, with some who had mixed among them in the hope that the knights would be spared, to the number of about eighty, were put to the sword; and lastly, some three hundred hereties burnt in this world were thus given over by him to the eternal fire, and Guirande, the lady of the chateau, cast into a well, was there crushed down with stones."

The holy army commenced its second year's campaign by taking the castle of Brom, and shockingly mutilating about one hundred of its defenders. He cut off their noses and tore out their eyes; but one individual was left one eye, so that he might be able to conduct the Christian savages to the town of

Carabat. The only choice left to prisoners was apostacy, or fire, or mutilation. When Montfort advanced to the attack of Toulouse, the peasants laboring in the field were slaughtered—men, women, and children were butchered, the crops were destroyed, and cottages and villages were burned to the ground.

For more than twenty years Innocent carried on the persecution against the poor defenseless Albigenses. During the whole term of his pontificate, this pope was never idle in his unmerciful pursuit of heretical blood. The cruel crusade continued until not a vestige of the dissenting doctrines of the Albigenses was to be seen, and its Church was drowned in the blood of its defenders. This cruel, crafty, and ambitious pope greatly extended his temporal dominions, and raised the papal authority to its highest degree of power.

He died at Perugia in 1216. Perhaps no ruler ever exercised such supremacy over the spiritual and temporal affairs of the world as Innocent III. The papal power has been the most absolute power known among men. Blind and implicit obedience to God's vicegerent was considered essential to salvation, Such a man as Innocent III., by a skillful manipulation of the papal machinery, was capable of intimidating the mightiest monarchs and of shaking the power of the strongest governments; and that the popes never failed to employ their terrible power for the furtherance of their nefarious projects is a fact written with the blood and tears of nations. The papal power has proved more pestiferous than the fabled monsters of antiquity, and its noxious vapors have broken in storms of pestilence, blood, and death in every part of earth. The greatest calamities that have afflicted the race have been originated or instigated by the Roman pontiffs; and it should be the heartfelt hope of every well-wisher of human kind that the present pope may be the last of this infamous line of Christian champions.

SIMON DE MONTFORT.

We have already given some account of the persecution of the Albigenses. (See St. Dominic, p. 344.) Innocent III. was pope. He had dispatched his legates, Guy and Regnier, from Rome for the purpose of extirpating heresy in the south of France. Armed with papal authority, they ravaged the fairest provinces of France, and committed large numbers of the population to the flames. The pope proclaimed a crusade against the unoffending and defenceless Albigenses, and sent an army of priests throughout Europe to raise recruits for the holy war. The proscribed heretics were the subjects of Raymond VI., count of Toulouse, who seems to have been a man of too much humanity to engage in this wicked war of extermination. He refused to append his name to a treaty which was to authorize a hostile army to pillage his possessions and make his vassals the victims of Romish cruelty. He was excommunicated and his country was laid under an interdict.

The Church published pardon and indulgence to all people —guaranteeing to them remission for all the vices and crimes of a life—if they would engage in the holy war of plunder and extermination against the Albigenses. Never before was there so popular a crusade. In the name of the pope and the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, all to whom war was a pleasure had unrestricted license to massacre men, women, and children, and appropriate or destroy their property, for which they were to receive plenary absolution of all sins committed from the day of their birth to that of their death. Such were the means employed by a cruel and crafty pope in order to crush such as he chose to brand with the name of heretics.

About the middle of July, 1209, the crusading army gathered under the walls of the city of Beziers. The bishop of the city vainly tried to persuade his terrified flock to avert their destruction by surrendering their heretical fellow-citizens. The replied that their Lord would not fail to succor them; and rather than commit the baseness demanded of them, they would eat their own children.

Beziers had a population of fifteen thousand, yet in this time of terror the influx of fugitives from the surrounding country had increased it to sixty thousand. The city fell, and the inhabitants were given over to butchery. The soldiers asked the pope's legate, Arnold Amalric, how they should distinguish the Catholics from the heretics. The reply was, "*Kill them all; the Lord will know his own!*" And they were all killed by these blood-thirsty popish zealots. Not one person was spared alive. Thousands were butchered in the churches, blood drenched the altars, and flowed in crimson torrents through the streets. After the last living creature in Beziers had been murdered, the city was pillaged and set on fire. Not a house was left standing; not one human being was left to breathe. All done to preserve the purity of the true faith.

Other equally destructive crusades were directed against these peaceful people, in which Simon de Montfort acquired an infamous fame by his zeal and ferocious cruelty. This man was a descendant of the lords of Montfort, near Paris. His historical career dates from 1199, when he went to the Holy Land as one of the companions-in-arms of the count of Champagne. In 1208 he was appointed chief of the barbarous crusade against the heretics of the south of France. He now gave full scope to his cruelty. The inhabitants of Lauraguais and Menerbois he caused to be hanged on gibbets, Having taken Brom by assault, he took more than a hundred of the wretched inhabitants, and having torn out their eyes and cut off their noses, sent them, under the guidance of a one-eyed man, to the castle of Cabaret, to intimate to the garrison the fate which awaited them. Finding the fortress

deserted, he sent out the soldiers to destroy the vines and the olive trees in the surrounding country.

In the month of June, 1210, Montfort appeared before the castle of Menerbe. This was reputed to be the strongest fortress in the south of France. For seven weeks the inhabitants defended themselves with unexampled valor. But water began to fail, and the heat of the season became insufferable. Guiard, the commander of the castle, himself went to the camp of the crusaders, and settled with Montfort the terms for the surrender of the place. But before they were carried into effect, Montfort disavowed them as not being binding by reason of the absence of the pope's legate, and declared the negotiations broken off. On the 22d of July the holy hordes of Montfort entered the castle, singing Te Deum, and carrying the crucifix. The doomed heretics were assembled, the men in one house, the women in another, and there, on their knees, resigned themselves to their fate. Montfort caused a prodigious pile of wood to be made. He then went to the two houses of the assembled Albigenses, and told them, "Be converted to the Catholic fate or mount this pile." None wavered. Fire was set to the wood, the heretics were brought to the blazing pile, into the flames of which they voluntarily threw themselves, to the number of one hundred and fifty.

In May, 1211, Montfort captured Lavaur. When the breach in the wall was effected, and the crusaders were about to enter and begin the massacre, according to their usual custom, the bishops, the abbot of Cordieu, and all the priests, clothed in their pontifical habits, giving themselves up to the joy of seeing the carnage begin, sang *Veni Creator*. The knights mounted the breach; resistance was impossible; and the only care of Simon de Montfort was to prevent the crusaders from falling upon the inhabitants, to beseech them rather to make prisoners, that the priests of the living God might not be deprived of their promised joys. "Very soon," says their own monkish historian, "they dragged out of the castle Aimery, the lord of Montreal, and other knights, to the

number of eighty. The noble Count Montfort immediately ordered them to be hanged upon the gallows; but as soon as Aimery—the stoutest among them—was hanged, the gallows fell, for in their great haste they had not fixed it well in the earth. The count, seeing that this would produce great delay, ordered the rest to be massacred; and the pilgrims, receiving the order with the greatest avidity, very soon massacred them all on the spot. The lady of the castle, who was sister of Aimery, and an execrable heretic, was, by the count's order, thrown into a pit, which was then filled up with stones. Afterwards our pilgrims collected the innumerable heretics which the castle contained, and *burned them with the utmost joy*" (Petrus Vallensis). The soldiers of the Church next took the castle of Cassoro. They here seized sixty heretics, and "burned them with the utmost joy."

But enough of these sickening scenes have been given to show the character of Montfort. We only accord him a place in this volume as an eminent exposition of the spirit of Catholic Christianity of the time in which he lived. He was killed at the siege of Toulouse in 1218. His diabolical acts may be considered the deliberate acts of the Romish Church. Let it be remembered that all these cruelties were prompted, encouraged, and sanctioned by an "infallible" Church. The dogma on which all these terrible transactions were founded is, that the Church possesses the right to extirpate heresy. It is a dogma acted upon at the time of these cruel crusades against the Albigenses, and at no period has it ever been renounced by any official act. During the six hundred years that have followed these events, the Catholic Church has invariably, far as occasions have served, avowed the same principles and perpetrated the same deeds. The Inquisition was brought into constant use for the ratification of this article of faith. Thomas Aquinus, and all the great luminaries of the Church, as well as council after council, held that heretics ought justly to be killed: and we challenge any one to point out one single instance on the page of history wherein the Church of Rome, to the full extent of her inquisitorial

power, has not tried to extirpate heresy and exterminate heretics, with or without the consent of the sovereigns in whose dominions they may be found. And, unfortunately for mankind, she has never failed to find men like Simon de Montfort to execute her damnable decrees.

We extract the following from the Introduction to Sismondi: "The dogma on which all these transactions are founded is—that the Church possesses the right to extirpate heresy, and to use all the means which she may judge necessary for that purpose. It was on this dogma that Innocent III. and his legates preached the crusade against the heretics, and promised to those engaged in it the full remission of all sins; it was on this dogma that they excommunicated the civil powers by whom they were, or were supposed to be protected, and disposed of their dominions to those who had assisted in this spiritual warfare. This dogma was repeatedly avowed by provincial councils, and finally ratified by a general council, the fourth of Lateran. It was received by the tacit, nay, by the cordial and triumphant assent of the universal Church, and had also the sanction of the civil authorities, who received from the Church the spoils of deposed and persecuted princes. We can, therefore, conceive of nothing which should be still necessary to constitute this dogma an article of faith, and hold ourselves justified in considering the Church of Rome to claim, as of divine authority, the right to extirpate heresy, and for this purpose, if she judge it necessary, to extirpate the heretics."

INNOCENT IV.

After the death of Celestin IV., who had been poisoned by the priests after a reign of eighteen days, the holy see was vacant for two years. The poisoning of Celestin had plunged Rome into consternation and alarm. The people, who had hoped for a term of peace and prosperity under this pope. loudly demanded the punishment of the guilty. An investigation was commenced, but it led to such revelations that the magistrates were compelled to stop the inquiries, it being discovered that the infamous poisoners were pious and powerful cardinals and archbishops.

There remained in the sacred college at Rome but six cardinals, all ambitious of becoming pope, and each unwilling to vote for any of the others. Thus affairs remained until Frederic of Germany threatened to hang them if they prolonged their rivalry. But threats were of no avail. The cardinals still quarreled. Finally Frederic led his army to Rome, laid siege to the city, and starved the cardinals into compliance with his demands; and in June, 1243, the conclave proclaimed as pope Sinibald of Fiesca, a cardinal priest of the order of St. Lawrence. He was enthroned by the name of Innocent IV., after having submitted to the usual tests.

Previous to his election he had been an intimate friend of the Emperor Frederic, but once securely on the papal throne he became his most implacable enemy. From the coronation of Frederic, in 1212, down to the accession to the papal throne of Innocent, in 1243, there had been but little peace between Germany and the holy see. Frederic was tired of war, and attempted to negotiate with Innocent, but the first negotiation was without any result on account of the obstinacy of

the pope, who rejected the just claims of the emperor. A second attempt was made to treat with the holy Father, but the pope was more imperious and exacting than before. The patience of Frederic was exhausted by these repeated failures, and he threatened to compel the pope to recognize his rights. He assembled his army and marched again for Rome. Alarmed at the approach of Frederic, the holy Father fled from Rome, and, in company with his cardinals, took refuge in Genoa. Innocent asked permission of the king of France to establish his see in Rheims, but was refused. Like refusals were received to overtures which he made to Spain, England, and several other kingdoms. Says a writer of that time: "They knew too well the avidity and despotism of the Roman court to wish for the presence of the holy Father; the people were beginning to comprehend that religion was only a pretext made use of by the legates to pillage them; and they had learned from recent examples that popes and their cardinals, like swarms of grasshoppers, left behind them but ruin and desolation."

Disgracefully repulsed on all sides, and afraid to remain in Italy, Innocent sought shelter in Lyons, a neutral city belonging to an archbishop. Once established there, he convoked a general council. Following the usage of his predecessors, and regardless of the rights of the archbishop who had received him, he seized on his palace, his goods, and all his authority, and disposed of cures, prebends, and benefices, and sold them to strangers, or gave them to favorites and minions. At length the Lyonese, indignant at the conduct of the holy Father, revolted against him, and protested, with oaths, that if the Italian priests showed themselves in their churches, they would cast them into the Rhone.

The power of the pope had almost passed away, but the prestige of the name still remained, and that proved sufficient to draw bishops, prelates, and lords to Lyons, and the council assembled. And from this council came events which plunged all Europe in war, and shed the blood of hundreds of thousands of innocent men.

At the close of the first synod, Innocent pronounced the sentence of excommunication and deposition against Frederic, declaring the empire vacant, and ordering the election of a new emperor. Not content with the confusion which his sentence had created in the empire, this pious agent of the Almighty God took assassins into his pay, and organized a vast conspiracy, into which he induced the relatives and friends of the emperor to enter. But the plot of this most holy pope was discovered, and some of the would-be assassins paid for their treason with their heads.

But the pope was not content. He used all the cunning of his nature to create confusion in the empire. Intrigues were entered into, and the pious plots succeeded. Says Jurien: "Then the empire was covered with armed men, who ravaged by turns the most beautiful provinces. In Germany, Conrad combated for his father; in Italy, Frederic disputed with his enemies for his crown and life. We see nothing but leagues, revolts, factions, sieges, and battles: everywhere pillage, incendiarism, and massacres reigned. The landgrave Henry, he whom the pope had proclaimed king, having been killed in a skirmish, Innocent proclaimed in his place William, count of Holland, who, in his turn, was forced to fly before the arms of young Conrad. During an entire year the war continued with the same fury, and Christian blood was shed by torrents in the name of an execrable pope."

Though the pope succeeded in setting the different nations at war with each other, he gained but little addition to his power. Furious at the ill-success of his intrigues against Frederic, who still remained unconquered, he tried his power upon less redoubtable princes. He excommunicated James, king of Arragon, for having punished a bishop who had sold State secrets to the enemy. Upon the accusation of the prelates of Portugal, he anathematized King Sancho II. An interdict was pronounced against his States, the sovereign was deposed, and the regency given to the father of the prince. This interference by the pope in the affairs of Spain and Portugal gave rise to cruel wars, and for several years the

Portuguese and Spaniards covered their countries with massacres and incendiarism.

The ecclesiastical thunders were not so effective in England. The pope's legates, who had come, armed with anathemas, to lay new tithes upon the people for the support of the pope, were driven in disgrace from that kingdom. Innocent, incensed that a monarch dared to protect his people against the rapacity of himself and his legates, immediately fulminated a bull of excommunication against the king of England, but it fell harmless upon the head of that prince, and only served to unmask the hypocrisy and venom of the pope.

France, during this time, distinguished herself by her religious enthusiasm. Although she had been drained three times during the pontificate of Grégory IX., she still furnished the most money to the pope, and Louis IX., afterwards canonized as St. Louis, undertook a new crusade for the recovery of the Holy Land. Urged on by the pope, who seemed to delight in battle and bloodshed if he was safe himself, Louis set out with a numerous army upon the twelfth of June, 1248, for Palestine. At first he gained some advantage over the Saracens, but they soon overpowered his army, cut it to pieces, and Louis fell into their hands. This disaster lost the kingdom all its valiant youth and the remainder of its gold, which it had to give for the ransom of its pious and fanatical king. Of this crusade, one of the officers who acompanied the king, writes as follows:

"The barons, knights, and other nobles who were in the camp of St. Louis, and who should have wisely kept the money which they had for their future wants, spent it foolishly in banquets and festivities. Thus, when their ruin was commenced, they were obliged, in order to live, to rob the soldiers. Misery soon led to demoralization. No woman nor girl could enter the camp without being violated on the plain, and led into the lupanars which were kept around the royal pavilion; finally, those who would wish to relate all the abominations with young pages, nay, even of the sins against nature, would risk their salvation from the terms they would

be compelled to use." And Louis, the leader of this band of inhuman wretches, is now a saint in the Church.

Whilst Louis was a captive among the Saracens, Innocent was pursuing Frederic with his hatred and was subsidizing assassins. He had by bribes won over to his schemes Peter de Vignes, physician to Frederic, who was at the same time his confidant and counselor. Frederic being taken ill on account of the fatigue he had undergone in the wars for the preservation of his empire, Peter de Vignes called a physician from Lyons to his assistance, and, acting under the advice of the pope, they presented a poisoned beverage to the suffering monarch. Frederic suspected treachery, and when the assassins gave the cup into his hands, he requested the Italian physician to taste it himself. The latter, fearful of being caught in his own snare, but at the same time not daring to refuse, raised the cup to his lips, made a false step, and dropped the vessel to the floor. The guards immediately entered. The emperor caused them to take up the liquor with a sponge, and ordered some condemned criminals to drink it in his presence. The unfortunate wretches immediately expired in horrible convulsions. This was enough to satisfy the emperor that his suspicions were correct, and he at once caused the emissary of the pope to be strangled, and condemned Peter de Vignes to have his eyes torn out.

Frederic had hardly escaped from this infamous plot of the pontifical poisoner when he learned that his son, Henry, king of Sardinia, had been taken prisoner by the Bolognese and that another of his children was dead. Overwhelmed by so many disasters, worn out and wasted away by disease, and weary of carnage and warfare, he offered peace on advantageous terms to the holy see. But Innocent, seeing his advantage, refused all his overtures, and even spurned his envoys with contempt, and continued his bloodthirsty and heartless work of pitting nation against nation and man against man. At length Frederic was attacked by a fatal disease, and, after languishing a year with a consuming fever, he died December 4, 1250, leaving the kingdom to his son.

The pope, who was still in Lyons, immediately endeavored to kindle civil war in Germany and Sicily, and to rouse the petty princes and nobles against the young Conrad; and he succeeded too well in his hellish work. Reiterating his excommunication against the memory of Frederic, and anathematizing young Conrad, he left Lyons and returned to Italy to place himself at the head of the forces of his party. But Conrad, nothing daunted by the papal anathema, marched into Italy at the head of his army, and, with the assistance of the Venetians, gained a brilliant victory over his opponents.

This defeat, far from discouraging the pontiff, only rendered his hatred more violent; and not being able to procure more troops, he sent emissaries into Brabant, Flanders, and France to preach a crusade against the Emperor Conrad, promising to those who would undertake it indulgences more extensive than those granted to the crusaders of the Holy Land. These latter only gained pardon for their sins, whilst those who would take up arms against Conrad would obtain for themselves, their children, and their families the right of committing all crimes with impunity.

The French, exhausted by these incessant demands for men and money, drove the missionaries out of all the cities of the kingdom. France had contributed liberally of her blood and treasure to assist the pope against the Saracens, against the Emperor Frederic, and against the Emperor Conrad, until now her young men were slain and her treasury was empty. The eyes of the people began to open. They complained loudly of the pope, and accused him of being the cause of all the disasters which overwhelmed Europe. They blamed the policy of the holy see, which not only urged on the English, Germans, and French into wars of extermination in the Holy Land, but endeavored to use the nations of Europe against each other in such a manner as to increase its power. Finally a decree was issued by the regency of France which authorized the confiscation of the property of the fanatics who should be foolish enough to join the crusade against Conrad.

This wise step crushed the crusade against Conrad on the part of France.

But the pope was not yet disheartened. With the tenacity of the inhuman fiend that he was, he adhered to his hellish purpose of again embroiling Europe in a war for the purpose of humbling Conrad. He demanded succor of England. Instead of responding to his demand for aid, the following circular was sent to all the ecclesiastics of England by the bishop of Lincoln, a venerable prelate, esteemed by all on account of his wisdom and the purity of his morals:

"The pontiff . . . desires to govern us as a despot, and to dispose at his will of our fortunes and our lives. Before him many popes have afflicted the Church. Innocent surpasses them all in wickedness. He has covered Christian kingdoms with usurious monks a thousand times harder than the Jews. He has ordained minor brothers and preaching friars, called in at the last moments of the faithful to frighten them, in order to extort from them testaments in favor of the holy see. Under pretexts of crusades, he encourages the odious traffic in indulgences so well that now they sell absolution to the laity, as in former times they sold animals in the temple; and his agents measure out salvation by the amount of money given them.

"He sells churches, prebends, and benefices to strangers, ignorant and unlettered priests; and these intruders, on arriving in their new cures, can neither preach nor receive confessions, nor even succor the poor, because they do not understand the language of the inhabitants. He has introduced the custom of buying bishoprics, without having received holy orders, and only to get the revenues. Finally, he has filled the world with so many scandals and abominations that we cannot enumerate all his robberies, adulteries, assassinations; and as we cannot deliver Christendom from this prop of Satan, at least let us protect Great Britain against the encroachments of this enemy of humanity."

Still the pope did not despair. His monks were set to work, and soon excited the Italians to take up arms against

Conrad. At length this pious pontiff, by a masterstroke of his peculiar genius, rid himself of his great enemy. By promising him the imperial crown, he instigated Mainfroy, brother of Conrad, to poison him; and he succeeded in his murderous project.

Upon the death of Conrad, Innocent treated Manifroy with contempt. He signified to him, as well as to the leaders of their party, that they must leave the Roman Church sovereign mistress of the kingdom of Sicily and its dependencies. He then sent his nephew, William of Fiesca, into Sicily in the capacity of legate, to govern the kingdom, and supported him with a numerous army. He permitted him to seize on the revenues of the vacant sees as prebends, and gave him full power to impose collections, to coin money, and to confiscate the property of those who had supported Frederic in the last wars, and, finally, to lay hands on all the deposits of money and arms he might find in the kingdom. The only reward the dastardly Mainfroy received for his fratricidal zeal in the service of this most infamous pope was the countships of Gravine and Tricarique.

This holy champion of the Christian Church did not long survive Frederic, and, on the seventh of December, 1254, he died of a malady which had been brought on by his infamous and licentious excesses.

PETER THE HERMIT

AND THE CRUSADES.

Peter the Hermit was a Frenchman who resided in Amiens in Picardy. He was remarkable for his zeal in the cause of the Church and for fighting those who did not embrace the same faith. He renounced a military life, and undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Like large numbers of others, he believed that a pilgrimage to Palestine would atone for all the sins and errors a man could commit in a lifetime. Towards the close of the eleventh century a widespread feeling was entertained in many European countries that the last days of the world were near at hand, and it was believed that all who reached the Holy Land and died there would receive a sure passport to heaven.

Peter was one of this number, and after a return from a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre, by permission from Pope Urban II., he visited many places and spoke to the people in the most impassioned manner upon the importance of pilgrimages and a crusade to the Holy Land. The cross was used upon the banners of Peter, and for this reason the expedition which he was foremost in inaugurating was called the Crusade. The appearance, zeal, and eloquence of the ill-shaped and diminutive hermit produced a prodigious effect upon the superstitious populace, who were easily wheedled and influenced upon subjects pertaining to religion. All ranks and ages of both sexes turned out to listen to him, and he wielded a prodigious influence over them.

The Crusades were a series of wars undertaken by Christians professedly for the purpose of delivering the Holy Land from the dominion of the Infidels, or the believers in another

God and another prophet. It was claimed that these wars were made necessary not only by the profanation involved in the fact of Mohammedan rule over the country which had been the birthplace and cradle of Christianity but by the insults which were constantly inflicted on Christian pilgrims. From age to age the belief had been growing that no work could conduce more to the soul's health than a pilgrimage to the holy places of Palestine. What Mecca was to the Mohammedan, Jerusalem was to the Christian. In keeping with the rapidity with which the two religions had spread over the world a feeling of the most intense hatred sprang into existence between them, and the Christians felt the most vehement indignation against their adversaries, the Saracens, and burned with an unquenchable desire to obliterate them from the face of the earth.

The tide of pilgrimage to the Holy City of the Christian faith set in strong early in the seventh century, about which time the hordes, who, under the belief that they were doing their God great service by visiting the sacred place, were arrested by the armies of the Persian king, Khosru III., the grandson of Nushirvan. Jerusalem was taken in the year 611. Ninety thousand Christians were claimed to have been slaughtered, and the disaster was crowned by carrying the Christian sacred cross into Persia. Marching into Egypt, Khosru received a letter from a citizen of Mecca, charging him to acknowledge Mohammed as the prophet of the one true God. He tore the letter into shreds. Mohammed replied only by warning the Persian king that his treatment of the letter was a sign of the way in which his kingdom would be treated by and by. The punishment of Khosru, however, did not come from Mohammed but from the Emperor Heraclius, who, waking from the sluggish inactivity of the earlier part of his reign, defeated Khosru in the passes of Mount Taurus and destroyed the birthplace of Zoroaster. Khosru was finally murdered by his own son.

In the year 629, Heraclius himself was induced to kneel among the worshipers in the church of the Holy Sepulchre.

In 637 the disciples of Mohammed having become the masters of Damascus, laid siege to Jerusalem. After a blockade of four months, a treaty made with the Caliph Omar secured to the Christians not only the safety of their persons and goods but the free exercise of their religion, subject only to the conditions that the Mohammedans should have admission to the churches at all hours; that the cross should not be seen on the exterior of any building or be carried about the streets, and, finally, that the Christians should be disarmed and show respect to their conquerers by wearing a distinguishing dress and rising up on the approach of the true believers —the Mohammedans. These were mild terms for the conquerers to give, and it is not difficult to imagine, in view of the subsequent atrocities of the Christians, that had the victory been reversed, they would have been very different. But, mild as they were, the indignities imposed upon the Christians were most acutely felt. Pilgrims and merchants, however, still visited Jerusalem without obstruction. Even the attack of the Fatimite caliph Hakem, four centuries later, in 1010, did not make the conditions in the Holy City materially worse. The rule of his predecessors in Egypt had been mild towards the Christians. Hakem was a zealot, and he had determined on the destruction of the Christian sanctuary.

With the completion of the first Christian millennium, a fresh impetus was given to the desire to make pilgrimages to the holy sanctuary at Jerusalem, and the belief became widespread that the end of the world was near at hand. The beginning of a new era, however, tended to dispel this hallucination; but the path pursued by the faithful was not strewn with roses. Inclement seasons, poverty, and sickness proved fatal to large numbers of pilgrims. The conversion of Hungary, or its acceptance of the Christian religion, removed a great barrier to those who had to traverse the heart of Europe in order to reach the Holy Land. These improved prospects were, however, soon clouded by the advance of the Seljukian Turks, who, in their inroads into the eastern empire, derived direct aid from the subjects of the emperor.

Before the close of the eleventh century the rule of the Turk had become more imperious at Jerusalem. The tolls of pilgrims had been increased, and extortions were practiced. These harsh exactions drove away the Christian sojourners and merchants from the Holy Land, and the weary pilgrims who returned to Europe had a pitiful story to tell. These recitals did much towards fanning into a flame the hatred and prejudices of the Christians of many European countries. Thousands swore vengeance against the Mohammedans, and they burned to march against their religious foes, and, with the death-dealing sword, spread the religion of the peace-loving Jesus over the land held under control by the followers of Mohammed. The mind of the ambitious and designing Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII., became fired with the desire to exterminate the worshipers of Allah. This feeling of hatred against the Turkish Infidels was infectious and spread rapidly. One of the first results of this contagion of hatred and revenge was that, in 1081, Robert Guiscard set out from Brundusium (Brindisi) with a fleet of one hundred and fifty ships, and a force of 30,000 men, but the success he met with gave very poor returns for the efforts made. Guiscard besieged Dyrrhachium (Durazzo) in vain; and under his son Bohemond his fleet was miserably defeated. Four years later Guiscard planned another expedition, raised another large force, but it was defeated by the death of its leader at Cefalonia.

During the pontificate of Urban II., ten years after the death of Gregory VII., a vast throng of clerks, laymen, and enthusiasts of all sorts gathered at Placentia to meet the pope and hear him dilate upon the importance of another attempt at a crusade to the Holy Land. In Italy, however, Urban felt that there was not sufficient enthusiasm upon the subject to justify the undertaking of the enterprise, and he soon made his way to his former home in the great abbey of Cluny, and in the autumn of 1095 appeared at Clermont in the territories of the count of Auvergne. Here he found no necessity for holding back. The preaching of Peter the

Hermit had aroused the ignorant masses to a state of wild enthusiasm. With the stature and ungainliness of a dwarf, emaciated by the austerities of a self-imposed discipline, Peter, who had forsaken his wife and abandoned his military standard under the counts of Boulogne, had returned from the Holy Land with his heart on fire, not so much from the memory of the hardships which he had himself undergone as for the cruelties he had seen inflicted upon his fellow-Christians. He was enthused with the spirit of hatred and revenge against the Infidel Turks who held rule in the Holy Land.

Armed with the special blessing of Pope Urban, this moral and physical monstrosity mounted an ass, and with bare head and feet, carrying a huge crucifix, traversed the Teutonic lands, rousing everywhere the uncontrollable hatred and desire for revenge which consumed his own soul. His vehemence carried all before him, none the less, perhaps, because he impressed upon his frenzied hearers the belief that however black their sins had been, all would be washed away in the waters of the river Jordan in Palestine, and that there were no crimes they could commit that would not be expiated by engaging in the grand crusade which he zealously labored to inaugurate.

Pope Urban himself harangued the people on the same subject. He mounted an elevated scaffold at Clermont, and, with the most impassioned appeals of which he was capable, urged the populace to march on against the Infidel Turks, and achieve honor and glory by exterminating them from the earth. He told them they were sure of success, sure to win an infinite blessing—the remission of all their sins—and even if they encountered sufferings and torments more excruciating than they were able to picture to themselves, that these very sufferings would redeem and happify their souls. "Go, then," he said, "on your errand of love, which will put out of sight all the ties that bind you to the spots which you have called your homes. Your homes, in truth, they are not. For the Christian all the world is exile, and all the world is at the same time his

country. If you leave a rich patrimony here, a better patrimony awaits you in the Holy Land. They who die will enter the mansions of heaven, while the living shall pay their vows before the sepulchre of their Lord. Blessed are they who, taking this vow upon them, shall obtain such a recompense; happy they who are led to such a conflict that they may share in such rewards." With the passionate outburst, "It is the will of God. It is the will of God," the vast throng broke in upon the pontiff's words. "It is indeed his will," the pope went on; "and let these words be your war-cry when you find yourselves in the presence of the enemy. You are soldiers of the cross; wear, then, on your breasts or on your shoulders the blood-red sign of him who died for the salvation of your souls."

It was such harangues and such arguments as these that hurled the forces of Latin Christendom on the Infidels, who had cursed the land of the East which they had subdued. The ignorant and vicious multitudes were taught to believe that however sinful and vile were their habits, by joining the army of the crusades and marching and fighting against the enemies of the cross, they would attain to as exalted a state of holiness as could be reached by the most austere monk or devoted priest. It was enjoined upon the eager hearers that the assumption of the banner of the cross set the debtor free from the demands of the creditor so long as he wore the sacred badge, and that nearly all temporal and spiritual blessings would accrue to those who engaged in the holy warfare of the Crusades.

This religious enthusiasm spread like wildfire among dry combustible material, and all classes were affected by the frenzy. As much money was necessary to be raised, and as many who decided to become soldiers of the cross wished to sell their homes or to mortgage the same to raise money, the demand for money became greatly increased and the price of real estate correspondingly depreciated. The trading and merchant classes were largely benefited by the state of things that arose. The consequence was to merge into fewer hands

the property which had been possessed by the many. The pope sent his legates into all the adjacent countries to enlist soldiers under the banner of the cross and to collect money for their support. He thus became at once the administrator of the vast revenues that were raised, partly by subsidies imposed as a necessity upon the clergy, partly by the voluntary contributions of the laity. With the pope the ecclesiastical body generally acquired immense power.

No nation, as such, took an active part in the movement, but it was confined to the individuals of the various nationalities, and this very fact serves, perhaps, to explain the measure of its success and its failure. Had it been necessary to wait for national action, it is more than probable the movement would never have been accomplished. It was all done under the auspices of the pope, and as he was above kings and emperors, their subjects and vassals took part in the enterprise partly in an independent manner. The result was that the hordes who thus enlisted under the cross were unorganized, a mass of individual religious adventurers who depended upon their own resources, and reckless pilgrims who possessed no resources and cared not to provide any.

The princes who engaged in the scheme were chiefly of the second class, who were sort of supernumeraries without power or place and were waiting for the wheel of fortune to turn in their favor. Most conspicuous among the leaders was Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lorraine, who is represented as a man of ability and strong personal character. It is stated that he brought ten thousand horsemen and eighty thousand infantry to the grand army, and he was accompanied by his brothers, Baldwin, and Eustace, count of Boulogne. Then followed Hugh, count of Vermandois, brother of Philip of France; Robert, duke of Normandy; Robert, count of Flanders; Stephen, count of Chartres, Troyes, and Blois; Adhemar, bishop of Puy, the first of the clergy who assumed the cross, and rewarded as such with the office of papal legate: Raymond, count of Toulouse, who, it is said, controlled one hundred and sixty thousand horse and foot, and who was

widely known for his haughtiness and avarice as much as for his bravery; Bohemond, son of Robert Guiscard; and Tancred, son of Marquis Odo the Good.

The feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1096, had been fixed upon by the Council of Clermont as the day on which the crusaders should set out for Constantinople, but little more than half the time had elapsed before Peter the Hermit, at the head of one hundred thousand men, women, and children, started on his insane march through Hungary to the Holy Land. Another similar multitude marched under Emico, count of Leiningen, and still another followed under the guidance of the monk Gotschalk, and behind these, it is stated, followed still two hundred thousand. These undisciplined multitudes committed in various places numerous excesses and outrages upon Jews and others. Of those who followed Peter, only seven thousand reached Constantinople; those by the order of Emperor Alexius were conveyed across the Bosphorus, and there, with the bands under Walter the Penniless, fell into a trap laid for them by the Seljukian Sultan David, surnamed Kilidj Arslan. A pyramid of human bones alone remained to tell the story of their sad fate when the hosts under Godfrey came thither on their march to Palestine. The suffering caused by the mad enterprise of course can never be known.

The fortune of the armies under the different chiefs who essayed to lead their hosts to the Holy Land was mostly the reverse of their expectations. Godfrey was wheedled by the Emperor Alexius, whose vassal he became, and the same was true of some of the other leaders. Bohemond, on reaching Constantinople, was indignant when he learned that his colleagues had become vassals, but he soon learned that he must at least seem to follow their example, and was repaid by a splendid bribe from Alexius, who had adopted Godfrey as his son. Raymond of Toulouse was more obstinate, and did not so readily fall in with the plans of the emperor.

It was not until the feast of Pentecost, 1097, that the last of the bands of Latin pilgrims was conveyed to the Asiatic

shores. During the whole interval the risk of conflict between the Latins and the Greeks was great. Between them there was a radical opposition. The crusading chiefs hated the idea of a central authority, and clung to the right of a private system of warfare. Among the Latins the clergy, having been brought by Hildebrand and Damiani under the yoke of celibacy, had become a close order or caste, which shrank from the notion of allegiance to any temporal master. The Greek priests, on the other hand, married; and as they acknowledged the power of the emperor, their western brethren despised them and called them cowards.

Some of the authorities who have written upon the Crusades have estimated the total number of the crusaders in this expedition as six millions of persons. After they were landed on the eastern shore of the Bosphorus they pressed forward on their journey, but were confronted by formidable foes under Kilidj Arslan. He swooped down upon them and destroyed large numbers. They invested his city of Nicea, and at length it was surrendered to Alexius. The crusaders, advancing on their eastward march, were again confronted by the Turks near the Phrygian Dorylæum, where a battle was desperately fought, and which ended in the defeat of the Turks; but the son of Kilidj Arslan, hastening on before the Crusaders as they marched to Cogni, Erekli, and Pisidian Antioch, gave out before the gates of each city that he was come as a conqueror. On his way he ravaged the land; in the towns the houses were also plundered and the graneries emptied. The crusaders consequently were compelled to journey through a country where very few supplies were to be had. The burning heat which they had to encounter caused fatal sickness, to which many fell victims. To increase their troubles, after the acquisition of Tarsus a serious dispute respecting the precedence of banners arose between two of the leaders, Tancred and Baldwin.

The crusaders pressed forward, but before three months had elapsed, they suffered most severely for want of food. They had wasted with frantic folly the cattle, the corn, and

the wine which had fallen into their hands; and when this first famine was relieved by a foraging expedition under Tancred, the supplies he brought in were wasted with criminal recklessness. The second famine caused several prominent persons to leave, among the rest Peter the Hermit, who had remained with them. Many of these deserters were, however, brought in. It was at this time, when the general prospect was so discouraging that the Fatimite caliph of Egypt offered to guarantee to all unarmed pilgrims an unmolested sojourn of one month in Jerusalem, and to aid the crusaders on their march to the Holy City, if they would acknowledge his supremacy within the bounds of his Syrian Empire. The reply, however, was brief and definite—God had destined Jerusalem for Christians, and if others held it, they were the invaders and should be cast out. This defiance was followed by a victory won over some reinforcements coming to the assistance of the Turks. The time went on, the siege still continued, and there were rumors that a Persian army was approaching. To Bohemond it seemed there was no hope of success except by fraud, and that from fraud he might reap a goodly harvest. In a renegade Christian named Phirouz he found a traitor ready to do his work, and he was able to announce in council that he would be able to deliver the city into their hands, and that he would do so if they would allow him to rule in Antioch as Baldwin ruled in Edessa. In spite of a protest from Raymond of Toulouse the compact was accepted, and on the same night Bohemond with a few followers climbed the wall and, having seized ten towers in which they killed all the guards, opened the gates and admitted the Christian hosts. In the confusion some of the besieged shut themselves up in the citadel; of the rest some ten thousand were massacred. The Turkish leader, Baghasian, escaped beyond the besiegers' lines: but he fell from his horse, a Christian cut off his head and carried it to the Christian camp. This ruse placed the Crusaders in possession of supplies once more, and in place of famine they again had plenty.

Other complications arose: Kerboga, prince of Mosul in

Persia, and Kilidj Arslan, with their forces, were approaching on one side to reinforce the Turks, while Alexius with a large body of fresh pilgrims from Europe was on the other to aid the crusaders. An order was given, in the face of superior forces, for them to turn back. Protesting in vain against this shameful breach of his duty and his vow, Guy a brother of Bohemond, in the vehemence of his rage, said that if God were all-powerful he would not suffer such things to be done.

In Antioch the desperation of the crusaders made them listen eagerly to stories of dreams and revelations from heaven. Various pretended visions were related by superstitious ones of the Savior and other distinguished characters presenting themselves. Peter Barthelemy, the chaplain of Raymond of Toulouse, related a revelation made to him by St. Andrew. The steel head of the spear which pierced the side of the Redeemer as he hung upon the cross had been hidden, according to this tale, in the church of St. Peter, and the recovery of this lance would be followed by immediate and decisive success. Two days were to be spent in special devotion; on the third day search was to be made for the long-lost weapon. The night had come, and their toil thus far had gone for nothing, when the priest stepped down into the pit. After a few strokes with his spade, he came upon the relic, which was carefully wrapped in a cloth of silk and gold. The priest displayed the lance head, and in a few minutes the wonderful tidings spread through the city. A short time after, Arnold, the chaplain of Bohemond, publicly denied the genuineness of the relic, and charged the chaplain of Raymond with deliberate imposture. The effect, however, of finding the relic, inspired the crusaders with increased courage and valor, and probably, in this respect, the bogus relic accomplished equally as great results as though it had been genuine. It had been successfully borne by the papal legate, Adhemar, and gave supposed aid to the crusaders in their contests with Kerboga, whom Peter the Hermit had, as an envoy, charged to submit to the alternative of baptism or retreat from a land which St. Peter had bestowed upon

Christians. The answer was a curt refusal, and a battle followed in which Bohemond was severely pressed by Kilidj Arslan, and Kerboga was bearing down the forces of Godfrey and Hugh of Vermandois, when some knights clothed in white armor and mounted on white horses were seen riding along on the slopes of the neighboring hills. This ruse was also turned to a good account. The legate cried out, "See, the saints are come to our help!" The imaginations of the beholders soon enabled them to see in the horsemen in white St. George, St. Theodore, and St. Maurice. The impulse awakened by this conviction was irresistible. The complete defeat of Arslan and Kerboga was followed by the surrender of the garrison in the citadel, and Bohemond remained lord of Antioch.

Flushed with this victory, the crusaders wished to be off to Jerusalem; but their leaders shrank from the danger of traversing waterless wastes at the close of a Syrian summer. While some of the crusaders were busied with expeditions against neighboring cities, many more were pressed by anxious cares arising from an outbreak of plague, which proved fatal to large numbers, and, among others, to Adhemar, the pope's legate.

Ten months after the fall of Antioch, the crusaders having become masters of Laodicea, they took up their march once more for the goal of their ambition. They crossed the plain of Berytus, along the narrow strip of country once celebrated for the wealth and splendor of the great Phœnician cities, and at length reached Jaffa, and then turned inland to Ramlah, a town only sixteen miles distant from Jerusalem. Two days later brought them in view of the Holy City. At the sight of the distant walls and towers they fell upon their knees in an outburst of thankfulness. The rest of the march was performed with bare feet and in the garb of pilgrims. But their armor was again put on when Raymond, with his followers, invested the city from the western side, while Godfrey and Tancred, with Robert of Normandy and Robert of Flanders, blockaded it from the north. On the fifth day a des-

perate attempt was made to storm the walls with a single ladder and with no siege instruments. It was no wonder that, in spite of all their efforts, the assailants should be beaten back and hurled from the ramparts. Thirty days more passed away while Gaston of Bearn was busily occupied in directing the construction of siege engines of timber brought from the woods of Shechem. During this time the besiegers were in the greatest distress from lack of water. All the cisterns and receptacles of all kinds for water had been destroyed by the Saracens, whose horsemen harrassed and cut off parties of Christians who were sent about the country in search of it.

On the second day of the final assault, when it seemed, in spite of the utmost efforts that could be made by the besiegers, that they must fail, it is claimed a horseman was seen on Mount Olivet waving his shield. "St. George the Martyr has again come to help us," shouted Godfrey, and the cry was taken up and carried along the ranks. It banished every feeling of weariness and aroused the Christians with overwhelming strength for the supreme effort. It was Friday, and late in the afternoon. Letold of Tournay, it is said, stood on the walls of Jerusalem, followed first by his brother Engelbert, and then by Godfrey. The gate of St. Stephen was stormed by Tancred; the Provençals climbed up the ramparts by ladders, and the city was in the hands of the Christians. So terrible was the carnage that followed that the horses of the Crusaders who rode up to the mosque of Omar were knee-deep in human blood. Infants were seized by the Christian warriors—who had forced themselves to the very homes and cradles of the little ones they thus destroyed—who dashed out their brains against the walls or hurled them over the battlements alive; every woman that could be seized was violated: men were roasted at fires; some were ripped up to see if they had swallowed gold, and the Jews were all burned alive in their synagogue; a massacre of nearly seventy thousand persons took place; and the "pope's legate was seen partaking in the triumph." What a

contrast to the conduct of the Arabs! When the Khalif Omar took Jerusalem, A. D. 637, he rode into the city by the side of the Patriarch Sophronius, conversing with him on its antiquities. At the hour of prayer, he declined to perform his devotions in the church of the Resurrection, in which he chanced to be, but prayed on the steps of the church of Constantine; "For," said he, to the patriarch, "had I done so, the Mussulmen in a future age would have infringed the treaty under color of imitating my example."

In the midst of these horrors Godfrey entered the church of the Sepulchre clothed in garments of white, barefooted and bareheaded. He knelt at the supposed tomb of Jesus and offered up thanksgiving for the victory that had been won over the Infidels, and for the giving of the Holy City into the charge of the faithful. That was a proud hour for Peter the Hermit. He then with joy beheld the fruition of the fond hopes and desires he had so long cherished, and for the consummation of which he had so long toiled and struggled.

On the following day the previous horrors were repeated on a greatly enlarged scale. Tancred had given a guarantee of safety to some three hundred captives, but in spite of his protest these unfortunate wretches were brought out and by Christian zealots killed in cold blood. A general massacre followed this, in which men, women, and children were hacked and hewn, and their dead bodies thrown together in heaps. The carnage was shocking to contemplate. When it was ended, the streets were washed by Saracen prisoners who were forced to remove the mutilated corpses of their murdered friends and relatives.

So ended the first and most important of the Crusades. Its history shows us clearly the nature of these religious wars and the cruel and revengeful spirit in which they were conducted. The worst passions of the human heart were aroused; the most fiendish propensities of the race were brought into operation. The relative difference between the Mohammedan on the one side and the Christian on the other in their antagonism was not great. Each, in his conduct towards the

other was cruel and relentless in the extreme. Their hatred seemed to know no bounds. How to afflict, to crush, and destroy each other seemed to be the feeling which actuated them.

Godfrey was made king of Jerusalem, though he showed the good sense to object to the title. His reign lasted barely one year. On his death his brother Baldwin was summoned from the principality of Edessa, in the year 1100 and was crowned king. During his reign of eighteen years most of the crusading chiefs passed away. Stephen of Chartres was slain at Ramlah in 1101. Four years later Raymond died on the sea-coast. In 1112 Tancred was cut off in the prime of manhood, and three years after Bohemond ended his stormy career at Antioch. Very few of the leaders and but a small proportion of their followers lived to return to their native countries. The sacrifice of life which grew out of this Crusade is almost beyond calculation or comprehension. By its means thousands upon thousands of unhappy mortals were hurried to premature death. The power of the pope was doubtless increased by the Crusades; and so was the dominion of the Emperor Alexius; aside from these, few derived any benefit from this terrible waste of life and happiness.

Peter the Hermit on his return to France founded the Abbey of Noirmoutier in the diocese of Liege, where he died in 1115. He was a man of remarkable character and possessed the qualities essential for a cruel religious zealot.

Scarcity of space necessitates but a brief mention of the eight succeeding Crusades that were started in Europe for the avowed purpose of wresting the burial-place of the Savior of men and the Holy City from the possession of the Infidel power, though perhaps with some of them political interests had more to do than with the one just considered.

The second Crusade was originated by St. Bernard, who was called its apostle, as Peter had been of the first. Conrad III. of Germany, and Louis VII. of France, led the armies constituting the fighting force, in 1147. The enterprise proved a most disastrous one. Thousands of lives were lost in an

attempted march across Asia Minor. The siege of Edessa was also a miserable failure.

The third Crusade was occasioned in 1189 by the capture of Jerusalem by Sultan Saladin. Frederic of Germany, Philip Augustus of France, and Richard Cœur de Lion of England, were chief among the confederate monarchs. The capture of Acre was almost the only fruit of this expensive and disastrous expedition. Frederic lost his life in Asia Minor. The main host went by sea. The quarrels of the leaders defeated all possible favorable results. Many thousands lost their lives for no good at all.

In 1212, in consequence of the utter failure of the attempt of Bernard, Conrad, and Louis, which was believed to be the result of the sinfulness of the parties who made up the expedition, a Childrens' Crusade was devised. None but innocent hands, it was thought, could accomplish the conquest of the Holy Land. Thirty thousand children, under the boy Stephen, and twenty thousand German boys and girls under a lad named Nicholas, started on the mad enterprise only to meet with utter failure by shipwreck, sickness, and hardship. In the name of religion the little innocents were thus doomed to terrible sufferings.

The fourth Crusade was conducted by the king of Hungary, Andrew II., in 1217, but was attended with no better results.

The fifth Crusade (1228) was conducted by Frederic II., grandson of the former Frederic, who recovered Jerusalem but for a short time. The gains made were very inadequate to the suffering and loss of life incident to the enterprise.

The sixth Crusade was conducted by St. Louis, king of France, against Egypt, but without success. Bootless suffering and a needless loss of life was the result of this ill-advised expedition.

The seventh Crusade was, in 1240, led by Richard, earl of Cornwall, brother of the English Henry III. It was attended with no marked results, and, like its predecessors, may be set down as a failure. It was closed by a treaty which was not kept.

The eighth Crusade was instigated by Pope Innocent IV., under the old cry of rescuing the Holy Land from the possession of the Infidel. Seven years, however, passed away (1249) before Louis IX. of France was ready to start in the holy campaign. He is represented as a pious, devoted, and conscientious man, but, not possessing the qualities of a general, his expedition has to be recorded as another serious failure.

The ninth and last Crusade was under the auspices of Pope Clement IV. St. Louis again started at the head of sixty thousand men, in 1270; but a storm drove his ships to Sardinia, and thence they sailed for Tunis. They encamped on the old site of Carthage, where a plague broke out among them, of which St. Louis, with large numbers of others, died. He was succeeded by Edward of England, who led his forces to Acre. He took Nazareth, whose inhabitants he massacred in cold blood. After negotiating a peace for ten years he returned to England. The crusading spirit having thus pretty thoroughly died out, no more such absurd enterprises were undertaken.

Among the wild and senseless schemes which men have engaged in, those called the Crusades were the most conspicuous and the most lamentable. The sufferings they engendered are beyond computation, and the loss of life and the destruction of property were enormous and fearful to contemplate, and all in the name of the peaceful religion of Jesus the redeemer of the human race. Historians, as a class, have shrank from giving an aggregate of the lives lost in consequence of the nine Crusades here briefly sketched, but that it reached several millions there can be little doubt. The estimate of fifty millions has been made by some writers, but these figures are probably considerably exaggerated. But the suffering and loss of life caused on both sides, under the respective banners of the crescent and the cross, were immense indeed. In view of all these enormities, a good-hearted man would declare that it would have been far better to have no religion at all than under its auspices to perpetrate such cruelties and inflict such a waste of human life.

About all the good result the Church obtained from the wars of the Crusades was a vast quantity of old bones of reputed saints, and other relics. The inhabitants of Palestine and Syria were aware of the passion of the crusaders for these articles, and they strove to make the gullibility of the Christians as large a source of profit as possible to themselves. Those who lived to return from Palestine brought with them vast numbers of pretended relics which they had purchased at high prices from the cunning Greeks and Syrians, and which were regarded as the noblest spoils that could crown any expedition. These relics were either committed to the custody of the clergy in the churches and monasteries, or most carefully preserved in their families from generation to generation. Among others of these relics, Matthew Paris relates that the Dominican friars brought a white stone in which, they asserted, Jesus Christ had left the impression of his feet. A handkerchief, said to have been Christ's, is worshiped at Besançon, which was brought by the crusaders from the Holy Land. Wood enough to build a large sized mansion, said to have been a part of the cross upon which Jesus was crucified, was brought from Palestine, or was procured after the return to Europe. The Genoese pretend to have received from Baldwin, second king of Jerusalem, the very dish in which the paschal lamb was served up to Christ and his disciples at the last supper, though this famous dish excites the laughter of even Father Labat in his travels in Spain and Italy. The Greeks and Syrians, whose avarice and fraud were excessive, imposed upon the credulity of the ignorant and simple Latins, and often sold them fictitious relics at enormous prices. The sacred treasures of musty bones and rags which the Christians of Europe preserved with so much care and pomposity, "even in our own times, with such pious ostentation," says Mosheim (ii. 441), "are certainly not more ancient than these holy wars, but were then purchased at a high rate from these cunning traders in superstition."

It cannot be denied that some good results grew out of the

Crusades; conspicuous was the improvement to European civilization by engrafting upon it the literature and scientific acquisitions of the eastern nations: but, in the grand summing up, the evils of those ill-timed campaigns greatly preponderate over all the good that can be set down on the credit side.

If but a partial estimate is made of the immense sums of treasure that were squandered in fitting out and prosecuting the nine different expeditions called the Crusades, it will be found that they amount to many millions of dollars. The treasure and the blood that were thus worse than thrown away to sustain and defend a system of superstition called the Christian religion against another equally erroneous system is truly appalling. Had the money and the life thus squandered been devoted to some worthy purpose calculated to benefit humanity, to improve the condition of the world, or to do service to some particular nation, a far greater good would have been secured: and at this time the world would not look back to those ill-starred enterprises and regret the destructive religious policy that ruled. Religion and superstition, in life and treasure, have cost the world a thousand times more than all its science, its learning, and its arts of peace.

BONIFACE VIII.

Peter de Mouron was born in 1213, in the province of Apulia. His parents were poor agriculturists. From his earliest youth he manifested so decided a love for prayer and meditation that his mother determined to teach him to read and even to give him some knowledge of the Scriptures. Having arrived at manhood, Peter retired to a hermitage situated on the side of a mountain. Afterwards, not finding this asylum sufficiently solitary, he climbed the summit of the rocks, which formed the crest of the mountain, and dug himself out a cell, which was a real burrow; for it was so small that he could scarcely stand upright in it, or stretch himself out to sleep. He remained three years in this cave, living on the alms of the peasants who came to solicit the aid of his prayers. As very many pious persons interested themselves in having him ordained priest, he went to Rome, where, notwithstanding his ignorance, he received orders. He then retired to another cave, called the cave of Magella, which had a very spacious grotto, where he reared an altar and gathered around him several anchorites, his disciples.

Here he passed whole weeks in fasting and maceration, which produced ecstatic fevers, insane reveries, and all kinds of delusions, visions, and hallucinations. Those around him regarded these ecstacies as revelations, and respected as prophecies his incoherent ravings. Ignorance aiding superstition, he obtained a wide reputation for sanctity. His multitude of visitors loaded him and his disciples with valuable presents, which were finally converted into a monastery, founded on papal authority.

Peter now redoubled his austerities. He ate but very little,

and that was only bread and water. He slept on the bare ground without straw or hay, and with a stone for his pillow; he wore a girdle of iron chains, and a coat of mail for a shirt. No wonder that at length there exhaled from the cell and the body of the filthy fanatic an odor so infected that no one could approach him without being suffocated! But such was the man whom—as Celestin V.—the cardinals elevated to the papacy, through selfish dread of the consequences of a further prolongation of the distracting vacancy in the holy see, which had now been going on for about a year. Soon, however, on account of his ignorance and over-simplicity, his attempts to impose this ignorance and over-simplicity on all around, and, in fact, his servile inefficiency in general, a conspiracy was formed by these same cardinals to hurl him from the throne. The ambitious Benedict Gaëtan (afterwards Boniface VIII.) placed himself at the head of the conspirators.

They used the following trick to determine Celestin to abandon the pontificate: It seems the pope was in the habit of shutting himself up in a secret chapel, for the sake of fasting and prayer, as he used to do in his mountain cell. Benedict caused the wall to be pierced behind the place occupied by the crucifix, and introduced into the opening a speaking-trumpet, which communicated with a chamber of the upper story; then, during the silence of the night, when the pontiff had retired to his chapel to pray, he called out to him in a loud and terrible voice, "Celestin! Celestin! cast aside the burden of the papacy; it is a charge beyond thy strength!"

As the poor old pope saw that, notwithstanding his efforts, the disorders of the clergy increased, his imagination, already much weakened, received this warning as an order from heaven, and he promised God to return to his hermitage. But he still hesitated, fearing, in the first place, that it was the devil that had spoken, and in the second, that it was not canonical for him to renounce his dignity. And as he dared not consult any one on the subject, he continued for weeks in a state of great perplexity. At length, one night, the same voice was heard, even more threatening than on the first

occasion. Celestin burst into tears, and besought God to show him the way clearly. "In accordance with the maxims of the popes," he said, "I can do all, and am infallible; how is it that from all sides complaints arise against me? Am I not obliged, myself, to admit the impossibility of preventing the misconduct, debauchery, exactions, and divisions of my ecclesiastics? Would it not be better for me to trample the tiara under foot, and avoid this impure Babylon which is called the Church: to devote myself as before, entirely to thee, Lord, in an inaccessible solitude? Have you, then, condemned me to bear this cross until my last hour?" Benedict replied through his speaking-trumpet: "Abdicate the papacy, Celestin; abdicate the papacy." A few days after this, the poor old man sent for some of the cardinals to his palace. He related to them how he had passed his life in repose and poverty; how he had been borne away from this contemplative life: and he added, shedding a flood of tears, "My great age [he was then about seventy-two years], my rustic manners, the simplicity of my language and morals, the ignorance of my mind, and my small experience in ecclesiastical intrigues make me fear lest I shall fall into an abyss. I believe that it is impossible to shun eternal damnation if I remain pope, and I come to ask from you authority to yield this dignity to one more worthy than I am." The cardinals feigned a great repugnance to reply, and counseled the pontiff to order public prayers and processions, in order to obtain from God a manifesto of his will for the greater good of the Church.

The upshot of it all was, that notwithstanding the king of Sicily, the bishops, cardinals, lords, the Celestin and other monks, and all the clergy came in procession to beseech him not to abdicate, he finally, on the festival of St. Luke, rose before the college of cardinals, and unrolling a paper, read from it: "I, Celestin, fifth of that name, declare that it is impossible for me to insure my salvation on the throne of St. Peter. Desiring, then, to lead a better life, and find again the repose and consolation of my past existence, I renounce the

sovereign dignity of the Church, of which my predecessors have made a trade. I recognize myself as incapable of exercising the pontifical functions; and I now give to the sacred college full and entire power to choose a chief to govern them." After the necessary technicalities had been gone through, Benedict caused the renunciation of the pope to be approved at once. An hour afterwards the assembly sent to inform Celestin that he was free. The holy Father then again became Peter de Mouron, quitted the pontifical garments, and re-took his coat of mail, his iron chain, and his hermit's frock; he made a last prayer before the miraculous crucifix of his chapel, and then went with naked feet toward his retreat on Mont de Mouron. Thus terminated the reign of this really pious anchorite.

In ten days the deceiving trumpeter, the personifier of God, the villain and the brute, Benedict Gaëtan, was, through his own unscrupulous machinations, chosen sovereign pontiff, by the name of Boniface VIII. As soon as he was proclaimed pontiff, he left Naples and started for Rome, passing through Anagni, where he had a grand reception from the people and a deputation of the Roman nobility. Two days afterwards he entered the holy city with immense pomp, considerably more so, by the bye, than that accompanying the great prototype's asinine entry into Jerusalem. There was an immense concourse of people. All the streets and public places were strewn with flowers, and it appeared as if all had been seized with a vertigo, on hearing the shouts of joy, and seeing the frenzied dances with which they celebrated the return of the villainous tyrant to Rome. Such, alas, has been the capricious nature of the vulgar herd, the loud-mouthed mob, the brute majority, in all ages and countries, and such, we regret to say, we believe it will be for a long time to come, unless evolution will exceptionally hasten its mighty car of progress.

After celebrating the silly and obscene ceremony of the pierced chair, Boniface was solemnly consecrated on the 16th of January, 1295. Immediately thereafter this pretended fol-

lower of the meek and lowly Jesus (who, however, if he ever existed, was, according to the gospels, anything but meek and lowly except when it suited his policy) mounted a white horse richly caparisoned; Charles, king of Sicily, held one of the reins, and the king of Hungary, his son, the other; they conducted him in this manner to the palace of St. John the Lateran: then they assisted him to dismount from his horse, accompanied him to his apartment, and served him at his table as mere waiting-men.

On the abdication of Celestin, care had already been taken by the cardinals to make that abdication regular, by inducing him to give a constitution, which he ordered to be inserted in the decretals, expressly providing that the pontiffs might renounce their dignity, and that the cardinals had the right to accept their renunciation. But this was not enough for the wily and suspicious Boniface, for on the day succeeding his consecration, he caused the act of abdication by Celestin to be confirmed by the sacred college, and in contempt of all the ecclesiastical rules he caused all the ecclesiastical renunciations made under oath to be valid. But all these precautions did not appear to him to be sufficient, he even had the cruelty to arrest his unfortunate predecessor. He that had been Celestin V., now simple Peter de Mouron again, was torn from his cell by the guards of Boniface, and conducted to his enemy. On his way the people ran to him in crowds to receive his blessing; some kissed his feet (as the false cardinals once had done), others cut off pieces of his robe and plucked the hairs of the ass he rode, to preserve them as precious relics. On his arrival at Rome he was received by the hypocritical Boniface with great demonstrations of friendship, but on the same evening the unfortunate old man was confined in the castle of Fulmona, and ordered to confess, that he might prepare to die. While the old hermit was unveiling the secrets of his soul, Boniface was concealed behind a tapestry, and when he had finished his confession, he suddenly appeared before him, reproached him for the impious regrets he had expressed for his abdication, and

caused him to be carried immediately to a horrible dungeon. Six knights and thirty soldiers were placed at the outer gate of the castle, to prevent any attempt to rescue him. Not being yet satisfied with this excessive rigor, and fearful of a rising of the indignant people in favor of his victim, Boniface decided to starve him to death. It was announced some days afterwards, that the holy anchorite, enfeebled by age, had expired whilst in the act of blessing the holy father; but the crime was soon discovered, and it rendered the assassin odious to all Christendom.

We will not narrate the numerous silly miracles which the legendaries attribute to Peter de Mouron to establish his sanctity: we shall only say that underneath all his ignorance, fanaticism, and filth, there beat a human heart too good for the breast of a pope, a heart that had justly attracted the veneration of the people by renouncing the trade of pompous popery, as he quaintly called it, in order to live a better life as a simple hermit.

Boniface, being now entirely freed from his competitor, dreamed only of realizing the plans which he had long formed of establishing the temporal and spiritual authority of the holy see over all Christian kingdoms. And we must say he was more than moderately successful. His reign was one of the glorious eras of the Church. It is true he failed to do more than anathematize king Frederic of Sicily, who treated the self-styled dispenser of thrones in much the same cavalier way that Menard, count of Tyrol, treated Nicholas IV. This Nicholas was the bravest of the brave as against the helpless dead. He it was that profaned the tombs of his enemies, by disinterring the corpses of a Cordelier monk and his disciple, and commanding the executioner to burn them on a scaffold, and cast their ashes to the wind, because they had dared to preach against him during their lifetime. But in turn this splendid coward was thus bearded by the live count of Tyrol in an address to his subjects, whom the holy Father sought to push into rebellion. "Give to the bishops your robe, and they will want your mantle," said the prince. "Who can be

so stupid or so cowardly as to endure without complaining the pride, avarice, perfidy, debaucheries, in a word, all the crimes of these wretches? The occupations of the priests are to get bastards, preside over orgies, and invent new modes of extorting money from the people. What! is it not enough for the shepherd to shear his flock, must he also murder it? We have been long enough under the prestige of religious ceremonies. We have long enough been trampled under the feet of the priests. Let us rise and exclaim, 'Death and extermination to the enemies of humanity.'" So, doubtless. Frederic of Sicily, after gaining the decisive victory of Falconara, must have felt towards Boniface.

But our pontiff was more successful with Philip the Handsome, of France, whom he caused to suspend his recently issued anti-papal edicts. The pope's war with the powerful Italian family of the Colonna, however, forced him to seek a full reconciliation with France. The wily Father well knew the resources of the Ghibeline party, to which the Colonnas belonged, since he had been one himself until the day of his election, when he had changed his banner and his fortune together. It is related that, no longer than a month after his election, he said to an archbishop, during the ceremony of Ash Wednesday: "Recollect, man, that thou art a Ghibeline, and wilt descend with them into the flames of hell;" and that, in place of sprinkling the ashes on his forehead he cast them into his eyes; thus showing how little importance he attached to simple decency and dignity, not to mention religious ceremony. The powerful Colonnas disregarded, from a sense of the pope's perfidy, his summons for them to appear before the sacred college; retired to their castle of Longuezza; protested against these proceedings of Boniface, and appealed from his censures to a general council, where they engaged to prove that he had poisoned Celestin V. They were seven mighty men in all, the two cardinals, James and Peter Colonna, and five brothers of the latter. Boniface had accused them of rebellion, excommunicated them, placed all their domains under interdict, and ordered the inquisitors to pursue them as

heretics. Unfortunately, the troops, whom they had levied in foreign countries, could not pass the frontiers; and they were obliged to struggle with their partisans alone against the multitude of fanatics whom Boniface had assembled. As, however, the want of money to pay his troops began to be felt, Boniface, as already said, sought a reconciliation with the court of France. To this end he canonized St. Louis of France and offered the crown of Germany, which he engaged to take from Adolphus of Nassau, to Philip, for his brother the Count de Valois. Duped by this perfidy, the king of France permitted the agents of the holy see to carry all the money which they could amass in his kingdom into Italy. But scarcely was the gold of the French, whose exportation up to this time Philip had sternly refused, safe in the treasury of St. Peter, when the treacherous pope, changing his language and conduct, favored the party of Albert of Austria, and crowned him emperor, in contempt of both his engagements.

But space will not allow us to notice many more of this ambitious villain's perfidious and shameless tricks and frauds. We have dwelt so long on the above instances in order to give the reader a full glimpse of the character of the man whose pontificate, in the opinion of many, culminated the glory of the Roman Catholic Church.

Boniface did not long continue to bestow his smiles on his *protégé*, whom he had made emperor of Germany. As soon as the latter married the sister of his old enemy, Philip of France, he immediately abandoned the party of Adelbert, and declared to the embassadors of that prince, at a solemn audience, that the election of their master was null; that he devoted him to the hatred of the people as a homicide, and that he did not recognize him as either king or emperor of the Romans. Then, putting on a guilded cuirass and covering himself with a casque, he poised a sword above his head, exclaiming: "There is no other Cæsar, nor king nor emperor, than I, the sovereign pontiff and successor of the apostles." He, after this, appeared in the great ceremonials sometimes

in the costume of the pope, sometimes in that proper to the emperor.

The year 1300, the last of the thirteenth century, offered a splendid opportunity to Boniface to extort money from the people. He instituted the jubilee, a kind of pilgrimage which was to take place at the close of the century, and for which he granted plenary indulgences to the fanatics who came to visit the tomb of the apostle and make offerings on it. One that was on the spot declares that, during that year, more than two hundred thousand pilgrims to Rome were counted. "By day and by night," adds he, "there were two clerks at the altar of St. Paul, with rakes in their hands, to rake up the gold which the faithful unceasingly threw down there. Boniface amassed an immense treasure from these donations, and the Romans were enriched by selling their wares, at excessive prices, to the simple people who came to obtain indulgences and empty their purses.

Other shameful acts of vilest treachery towards Philip the Handsome were the incitement through his creature, Bernard, of his own subjects against him, even promising indulgences and recompense to whoever would assassinate him; the publication of a bull, declaring himself to be the absolute sovereign of the kingdom of France; his declaration that the dynasty of the Capets was a race of thieves and murderers, and the ordering of solemn masses to be celebrated in the Roman churches as a token of his joy over the French disaster under the walls of Courtray. All this determined Philip to take revenge. He consequently held an assembly in the Louvre palace to hear the complaint which William of Nogaret (who, as embassador of Philip, had been insulted by the pope), had to prefer against Boniface. The embassador thus expressed himself: "I demand, illustrious lords, that the cardinal, Benedict Gaëtan, who calls himself pontiff, should be placed on trial as an Atheist, a simoniac, an enemy of God and men, incestuous, a robber, a sodomite, a destroyer of religion. I beseech the king to assemble the estates, to publish an ordinance convening a general council to judge Boni-

face. I also demand that they proceed without delay to the appointment of a vicar to govern the Roman Church, and that this anti-pope be immediately arrested."

Boniface, who thus found himself at war with the most powerful princes of Europe, discovered but too late the danger to which he had exposed himself by pursuing Philip too far. He, however, endeavored to contest the matter with him by putting in use this political axiom: "When you have three enemies, make peace with two, in order to combat the third; then exterminate the two others in succession." So, by great conciliation, he feigned great friendship toward Albert of Austria, whom he recognized as emperor, as well as toward Frederic of Sicily; but not before both had made liege homage to him for their empire and kingdom. He also tried to create for himself alliances in Hungary. But Church and State there flew in the very face of his presumptuous overtures. All sided with their king, Venceslas, son of the king of Bohemia, who had been chosen by the free will of the Hungarians, and against Boniface, who had declared the election irregular, claimed the free disposal of the throne, and declared that he would decide in favor of him who offered the greatest advantages to the holy see. For this dire piece of insult and mischief-making, even the Hungarian priests, regardless of ecclesiastical censures, continued to celebrate divine service and administer the sacraments; nay, further, they even excommunicated both the legate and the pope himself. But the blow was struck, and a civil war broke out, which lasted until 1310, when Charobert, the pope's choice and the grandson of Queen Mary of Hungary, was universally acknowledged as king. Thus was this ambitious pope's insolent reply to Venceslas' embassadors fully endorsed at last by the people, to wit, that the throne of Hungary was transmitted by order of succession, and not by voice of election. Truly the devil was working on the side of his own pontifical favorite.

Having thus assured himself of powerful allies, the pope recommenced his strife with Philip; he declared him deprived

of the throne, and gave his kingdom to whoever would deliver him up, dead or alive, to the holy see. The king, on his side, held an assembly of the States-general, in the gardens of the Louvre, to depose the pope. Three counts presented themselves before the nobility, clergy, and commons as the accusers of Boniface. They accused him of denying the immortality of the soul, and holding that it perished like the body, and that there was consequently no other life; they affirmed that he denied the presence of Jesus Christ in the eucharist, and called the host a piece of bad bread to which he paid no respect. They maintained that he preached publicly that the pope, being infallible, could commit incest, robberies, and murder without being criminal, and that it was heresy even to accuse him of having sinned; also, that he openly proclaimed fornication to be one of the most beautiful laws of nature, and that it alone revealed to him the existence of God. This execrable pope, they added, observes neither fasts nor abstinences, and he orders priests to reveal to him the secrets of the confessional, under the pretense that they should unveil to him the crimes of his enemies; he persecutes the minor and preaching brothers, and deprives them of their goods, under the pretense that they are hypocritical knaves, who levy extortions on the people; and thus he deserves to be called the robber of robbers. Finally, they produced witnesses to prove that the pope lived in concubinage with his two nieces, and had several children by both of them.

After having formally made these accusations, one of the arraigners—Du Plessis—formally demanded an appeal to a future council; the king declared himself the appellant; the bishops, abbots, the University of Paris, and all orders in the kingdom followed this example, and demanded the convocation of a general synod. Finally, at Rome itself, ten cardinals approved of the proceedings of France, and adhered to the appeal. Philip then sent deputies to all the courts of Europe, to announce that the council was to be held. Nogaret, his embassador at Rome, received orders to inform the

pope of the decision of the States-general, and to publish it in the cities of Italy. He acquitted himself very happily in his mission, and drew over to the party of his master a great number of lords, magistrates, citizens, and ecclesiastics, who were tired of the tyranny of Boniface. The latter then resolved to quit the holy city, where his enemies were all-powerful; he secretly abandoned the Vatican, and went to dwell at Anagni.

A few days after his arrival there, he assembled the cardinals who had followed him, and fulminated a terrible bull against Philip, whom he devoted, with his family and his posterity, to Satan and the execration of men, declaring his kingdom under interdict, freeing his subjects from the oath of fidelity, and giving his estates to the Emperor Albert of Austria. In this bull he summoned the Germans, English, and Flemings, to take up arms against France, and granted to them plenary indulgences for this war. Without losing time, Nogaret, on his side, acted with activity and remarkable address. Seconded by one of the Colonnas and another implacable enemy of the pope, he detached most of the cities adjoining the patrimony of St. Peter from the party of Boniface, and secretly assembled a troop of determined men, with whom he suddenly invested Anagni. His soldiers forced the gates of the city at the break of day on the seventh of September, 1303, and spread themselves through the streets, exclaiming, "Life to the king of France; death to Boniface!" They attacked the palace of Peter de Gaëtan, the nephew of the pope, which they carried at the first assault, and then laid siege to the fortress which the holy Father and his cardinals inhabited.

In this extremity, Boniface demanded a truce of some hours, under pretext of determining on what he would do, but in reality to excite a rising of the people in his favor. They, however, restrained by fear, dared not make the least movement. The holy Father then finding the delay which he had asked for about to expire, besought Sciarra Colonna to give him, in writing, the conditions which they demanded as

the price of peace. Sciarra replied to his envoy that if Boniface wished to save his life, he must, above all things, immediately reinstate the family of the Colonnas in all their wealth and dignities, and renounce the papacy. Those conditions having been reported to Boniface, he exclaimed, "No; I would rather die than cease to be pope."

In consequence, at three hours after noon, the truce having expired, a fresh assault was made by the soldiers, who scaled the walls and rushed into the apartments of the palace, which they pillaged. They found in the treasury so great a quantity of silver, precious stones, and valuable articles that Walsingham computes it as exceeding the united wealth of all the kings of that period.

Boniface, seeing that he had no means of escape from his enemies, clothed himself in his pontifical ornaments, placing the crown of Constantine on his head, and holding the apostolic keys in one hand and the cross in the other, placed himself on his throne, awaiting with firmness the arrival of his enemies. Nogaret, without being stopped by the majesty of this spectacle, approached him without any respect, and informed him of the proceedings of the States of France, summoning him to appear before a general council to justify his conduct. The pope not having even replied to this first address, Sciarra Colonna advanced in his turn, and demanded of him whether he was willing to renounce the papacy. "No!" said Boniface; "I would rather lose my life; slay me, if you dare; I will at least die pope." This would probably have happened but for the interference of Nogaret, for the soldiers had already seized Boniface. Nogaret stopped them by a gesture. "No; we shall not put to death this infamous priest," he said; "rather we shall drive him in disgrace from this apostolic chair, to which he is more attached than to existence. It will be the most terrible of chastisements for this proud man to spare his days, that he may pass them in opprobrium and humiliation. Then prepare thyself, dog," said he, turning to Boniface, "for the general council which is to assemble at Lyons to condemn thee."

This new insult exasperated the holy Father. He forgot the part of impassibility, which he had played until then, and fell into so violent a fit of rage that they thought him mad. He blasphemed the name of God, abjured Christ, cursed the king of France to his fourth generation, and called Sciarra Colonna the son of a prostitute. This was too much for the proud Colonna. He fell on Boniface, struck him on the face with his iron gauntlet until the blood flew, and would have broken his head if Nogaret had not wrested him from the hands of his enemies. Boniface was carried off wounded and confided to the custody of a Florentine captain, who confined him in one of the halls of the palace. His captivity lasted for three days, during which he refused to take any nourishment, fearful lest his enemies should poison him. He only ate four eggs, which were given to him by an old woman.

At length, on the fourth night, the inhabitants of Anagni, excited by the priests, attacked the French so furiously that they forced them to abandon the pontifical palace, and Nogaret and Colonna barely escaped with some soldiers, leaving the banner of France, which they had planted on the tower of the city, in the hands of their enemies. The pope, being freed from the hands of his foes, was carried to the public plaza, where, fearful of a return of ill fortune, he declared in the presence of the people that he pardoned those who had taken up arms against him; that he reinstated the Colonna family in all their possessions and dignities; and that he even pardoned William de Nogaret, the author of all his misfortunes. This hypocritical language gained for him some partisans.

But as soon as he was at Rome, and out of the reach of danger, he dreamed of nothing but vengeance, and passed his days and nights in preparing it. Concealed in the depths of his palace, for the purpose of maturing his Machiavelian plans, he passed whole weeks in reflection, without being willing to speak even with the officers of his court. He was heard frequently to exclaim aloud, "Malediction! anathema!" This continual irritation at last brought on a violent fever, and he became very ill. In his delirious fits he accused

himself of a prodigious number of crimes, and uttered frightful yells, "as if the very devil had seized on him." It was then that the prophetic curse of pope Celestin flashed most vividly to the remembrance of all around: "Curses on thee, Benedict Gaëtan. Thou hast mounted the throne like a fox, thou wilt reign like a lion, and die like a dog." Boniface, in a paroxysm of madness, gnawed his arms, and died on the 11th of October, 1303. He was buried at St. Peter's, in a chapel which he had built at the entrance of that church.

This pope was so cruel, crafty, proud, avaricious, and hypocritical, that he was reputed as damned, even by many of the clergy. But it is considered that he possessed great skill in the management of temporal affairs, and was profoundly versed in the Scriptures and in the canon of civil law. His hypocrisy, however, seemed to be the culminating point in his character, as we believe has been the case with tens of thousands of priests of all grades, from holy Father to simple deacon. Conscience stands appalled at the devilish daring of a man who could, from motives of mere ambition, avarice, and pleasure, so closely cling to the papal office and dignity when it is now well known that he believed in such propositions and axioms as the following, transcribed from authentic documents: "The gospel teaches more falsehoods than truths; the delivery of the Virgin is absurd; the incarnation of the Son of God is ridiculous; the dogma of transubstantiation is a folly;" "Religions are created by the ambitious to deceive men;" "Ecclesiastics must speak like the people, but they have not the same belief;" "The sums of money which the fable of Christ has produced the priests are incalculable;" "We must sell in the Church all that the simple wish to buy;" "I care no more for another life than for a bean;" "Men have souls like those of beasts, and just as immortal;" "It is no greater sin to abandon one's self to pleasure with a young girl or boy than to rub one's hands together."

And to show that he put his maxims into practice, we will recount the burlesque adventures of the chapel of our Lady of Loretto, as narrated by the historian Desmarets: "The

cardinal Benedict Gaëtan, has so skillfully used a speaking trumpet to determine Peter Mouron to abdicate that when he was chosen pope he made use of another piece of trickery to extort money from the faithful. He publicly announced that the angels being at his orders, he would cause them to carry off from Nazareth in Galilee, from the hands of the Mussulmen, the house in which the Virgin Mary had been born, in which she had been married to Joseph, and in which she had conceived through the operation of the Holy Spirit. But eight days had elapsed after this promise, when the holy Father ordered the people to go to Dalmatia to see the house which the angels had transported in their arms, and which they had placed on a desert hill called Tersatto, where it remained three years and seven months.

"As the length of the journey prevented many Christians from carrying their offerings there, the angels, always obedient to Boniface, transported it a second time into the midst of an immense forest in the territory of Racanati. After this second prodigy, the priests published the miracles of the holy house; they related that all nature thrilled with joy around the residence of the Virgin; that the winds murmured celestial melodies; that the oaks bent their heads in homage to the mother of God, and that a brilliant light illuminated the forest by night. The people soon hastened from all parts of Italy to see these marvels, and to offer presents to the holy Madonna. Unfortunately, the robbers, who are always so numerous in lower Italy, wished to divide with the Virgin the gifts of the pilgrims; and as the pope did not find his account in this, he ordered his angels to transport the house out of the forest. They deposited it in a field belonging to two brothers who had lost their father the evening before: it became a cause of dispute between them, each of them claiming possession of the lot on which it stood. To produce harmony, the angels carried of this miraculous house a fourth time, and deposited it in the midst of a field belonging to a holy woman named Lorretta. The Virgin Mary was doubtless much pleased with this choice, for from the thirteenth

century down to our own times it has not changed its place, or, what is more probable, the pope did not cause it to perform a fifth journey, because he had brought it near enough to Rome not to fear the brigands who had the sacrilegious audacity to share with the Madonna the offerings of the faithful."

As finishing strokes to this portrait of Boniface, we may state that Dante has placed the soul of this pontiff in the depths of hell, in the hole which Nicholas III. occupied before him; and that there were, in his time, designs at Rome representing Peter de Mouron, with a dove on his head, figuring the Holy Spirit: behind him came Boniface with a speaking trumpet in his hand, having a fox in his arms, whose claws were fixed in the back of Celestin V. while he lifted off his tiara with his nose. In the background of this picture, the artist had represented Boniface a second time with the pontifical ornaments, and dragged along by armed men, who struck him in the face with their gauntlets.

We have dwelt thus long upon Boniface, with his splendid impostures and cruel vices and crimes, not from any love of the contemplation of such a thoroughly devilish, though to the very last courageous character, but in order to show what kind of a broken reed this matter of papal infallibility really is. The life of Boniface VIII. alone, a universally recognized pope and almost as universally recognized scoundrel, is enough of itself to give the lie direct to all this lamentably ludicrous pretension. Whenever the reader meets this vulgar presumption on his way, let him only cry out "Boniface VIII.," and this ecclesiastical ghost is laid at once. No matter if we grant, for argument or for the humor of it, that all the other Fathers, popes, dignitaries, priests, deacons, acolytes, and catechumen of the holy mother Church were and are real saints, Israelites indeed, the one life of Boniface VIII. is enough, and more than enough, to impeach papal holiness and infallibility once and forever.

JOHN XXII.

Pope Clement V. died on the 20th of April, 1314. Soon as he closed his eyes, the cardinals and their mistresses and minions seized the treasures of the Church. The dead pope's nephew, Bernard, carried off chalices and ornaments worth more than a hundred thousand florins. The Countess de Foix stole all the pontiff's jewels. So completely was the property of the holy Father despoiled that there remained only an old traveling mantle to cover his dead body, and that nearly consumed by a lighted candle falling upon it. When there was nothing more left to plunder, the twenty-three cardinals fled to Carpentras and shut themselves up to elect a new pope. They were soon followed by companies of furious priests and domestics who had been deprived of their part of the booty. These created a dreadful tumult in the city, traversing the city with lighted torches, setting fire to the houses, and robbing the people. The panic-stricken cardinals escaped to their magnificent palaces at Avignon, where they squandered upon their mistresses the stolen spoils which Clement had hoarded from the gifts of the faithful.

Of course no pope was elected. The attention of the ecclesiastical robbers was divided between their mistresses and their stolen spoils for two years. The Christian Church was thus left for two whole years without an infallible head. Anarchy and the most embittered strife prevailed. Priests plundered the people, and inquisitors harassed and decimated them.

At length Philip of Poitiers, in order to put an end to the interregnum in the holy see, resorted to the expedient of writing to the cardinals to come to him secretly, promising

the tiara to each of them. On the appointed day they all mysteriously appeared at the city of Lyons, and proceeded to the monastery of the Preaching Brothers, according to the confidential orders of Philip. They were at once arrested and confined in a large hall. Philip swore he should keep them close prisoners on the frugal diet of bread and water until they named a new pope. Forty days passed, during which he daily diminished their rations, before this forced fast conquered the quarrelsome cardinals. They selected James d'Ossa to choose the worthiest among them as sovereign pontiff. This proud prelate placed the tiara on his own head, and proclaimed himself pope by the name of John XXII. This was in the year 1316. Such appears to have been God's particular method at this time for appointing the executor of his will upon earth. We will now proceed to investigate the subject of his choice.

At the time James d'Ossa seated himself in the papal chair he was seventy years old. He had risen from the lowest depths of poverty and obscurity. His father was a poor traveling hosier of Cahors. Finding the boy James a source of great embarrassment to him he disposed of him by placing him as a scullion in the household of a noble family of Arles. The wit of the little lad advanced him from the kitchen to the antechamber. One day the archbishop chanced to notice the young valet, and, astonished at his intelligence, he gave him skillful masters, under whom he made most marvelous progress. At the close of his studies his protector procured for him a bishopric. King Robert, upon the death of the archbishop of Arles, conferred upon him the appointment of chancellor. He was soon after elevated to the cardinalate by Clement V. His character seems to have been transformed into that of a human tiger on his reaching the pontificate. If possible, he became even prouder, greedier, more corrupt and hypocritical, than his predecessors. Not content with the ordinary enormous revenues of the Church and his share of the confiscations of the inquisitors, he had recourse to a system of speculation in crime, whereby he publicly sold

absolution for robbery, parricide, adultery, murder, incest, sodomy, and all the vices of humanity. He made sin a source of revenue for the holy treasury, in which the wealth of nations was engulfed. His avarice was only equaled by his pride and deceit.

He was not long in repairing the losses the holy see had sustained by the pillage of the cardinals upon the death of Clement V. Under the pretext of heresies he confiscated the wealth of citizens, and even of prelates and monasteries whose riches excited his cupidity. At that time there was a set of monks called the Fratricellists, or Poor Brothers. They wore a particular dress, built churches, founded communities, and maintained their order by begging, but without any rents to the holy treasury, like their brothers. They had thus succeeded in accumulating enormous wealth. This was coveted by the greedy pontiff, and he found a pretext for launching a bull of anathema against them. They were condemned as heretics, and not only were they stripped of their property, but their persons were handed over to the Inquisition.

This flagrant exhibition of the holy Father's detestable avarice raised a public clamor against him. He only published a new bull against them by which he joined calumny to cruelty. After setting forth his grievances against them, he adds: "Thus, is it not just that these abominable sectarians, who combat the holiness of our power, should be surrendered to the tribunals of the Inquisition to be burned alive without pity?"

From the following it seems that the alchemists were also particular objects of his vengeance: "We have been informed that Jean Damant, a physician, Jean de Limoges, Jacques, surnamed the Brabancin, and some others, apply themselves with condemnable perseverance to magical arts; that they frequently make use of mirrors, made under certain constellations, and enchanted figures; that they place themselves in cabalistic circles, and force the spirit of darkness to appear in their presence; that they can put men to death by the vio-

lence of their enchantments; that they confine demons in long-necked glass bottles, and torment them with fire, to cause them to reveal the past, the present, and the future; that they affirm that, by mere words, they can abridge or prolong the duration of existence; and, finally, that they have conspired against us, at the instigation of Louis of Bavaria, to wrest from us our tiara and our life by all sorts of conjurations and malpractices. We, consequently, order you to proceed against them as you would do in a case of heresy, that is, to hand them over to the inquisitors, that the violence of torture may draw from them an avowal of their crime."

And this has always been the course of the Church. It has always denounced the discoveries of the learned, strangled science, stifled thought, and burnt at the stake all who would enlighten the people and deliver them from the shackles of superstition.

John XXII. not only pursued heretics, monks, and men of learning with torture and death, but placed under the ban of the empire and pointed out to the inquisitors all the lords and princes who refused to render him homage for their possessions. But his anathemas, dreaded as they were by the ignorant faithful, produced no effect on Matthew Visconti. This prince was declared an obstinate heretic and a suitable victim for the bloodhounds of the Inquisition. In order to bring to bear against him the cupidity of other princes, the holy Father offered his possessions to whoever should conquer them. He organized bands of adventurers, and preached a general crusade against all his enemies. As pay to his recruits he gave indulgences and the power to commit rape, pillage, and murder on their route. The papal forces, made up of hireling wretches, united with the king of Naples, and marched against Matthew. At first they were successful, but Matthew finally repulsed them, and forced them from his territories.

At this period the political affairs of Europe were in a frightful state of disorder. Not even a general mention of the cruel wars and terrible battles that occurred can be given

in this place. As usual, the crooked and treacherous policy of the papal court tended to ferment the quarrels. Louis of Bavaria, and his cousin Frederic of Austria, disputed the throne of Germany, and inundated half of Europe with the blood of the people. Louis took his competitor prisoner, and secured the imperial crown. Pope John, in order to assert his supreme jurisdiction over the sovereignties of this world, cited the two rival claimants to the empire before him. Louis was a skillful politician, and put into play all the resources of policy and power to foil the holy Father. John launched the terrible thunders of Rome against his powerful antagonist, and ordered all the ecclesiastics of Italy and Germany to pursue him under penalty of excommunication, interdict, and confiscation; threatening, in case of refusal, to hand them over as heretics to the tribunal of the Inquisition.

Conceiving that the Fratricellists had offered him some fresh insult, John suspended his pursuit of the prince to renew his persecution of these old foes with increased violence. He ordered the arrest of the general of the order. But the bishops refused to act as instruments of the hatred of the holy Father. Some of the chief doctors of the sect presented their case to the emperor, and thus addressed him:

"Prince, for many years the throne of the Church has been occupied by wretches, who arrogate to themselves, in the name of Christ, the right of committing every crime with impunity, of despoiling kings and people of their wealth, and of putting to death in dreadful tortures those bold men who reject their audacious pretensions to infallibility. We come to you, prince, in the name of our brethren, to entreat you to employ all your efforts to destroy this horrible theocratic despotism and to overthrow from the pontifical chair this disgrace to humanity. Recall to your recollection that the priests are the most contemptible of men, and that the pope is the most infamous, the most abominable of priests. No longer suffer these thieves, these sodomites, these assassins, to enchain the nations and devour the substance of the laborious

people in sloth and debauchery. Act, prince, that you may see the termination of this scandal."

The emperor heartily espoused the cause of the doctors, and commissioned them to draw up his manifesto against the pope. This was a writing of extreme virulence, in which the holy Father was accused of a great number of crimes, among which was heresy. Unlike Boniface VIII., who openly gloried in being an Atheist, John sought to disprove the last charge, his other crimes being too notorious to attempt a refutation.

The old quarrel between him and the emperor was still kept up. Italy was in a state of ferment, both those powerful parties, the Guelphs and Ghibelines, maintaining by arms their pretensions to the sovereignty of the cities. The pope at this time resided at Avignon, in France. The emperor went to Rome, and was crowned in the church of St. Peter. After the ceremony he caused three edicts to be read from the pulpit of the church, by which he pledged himself to support the Catholic faith, honor the clergy, and protect the widow and orphan. On the very day on which Louis made so solemn a declaration of his peaceful intentions, the pope launched a terrible bull against him, calling the people to arms, and promising plenary indulgences to all who should take the cross against the imperial heretic.

At last the emperor resolved to revenge the audacity of the implacable old pope. He assembled the clergy, nobility, and people in the public square of the church of St. Peter. An Augustine monk mounted the platform, demanding three times in a loud voice: "Who among you wishes to defend the priest Jacques de Cahors, who calls himself John XXII?" No one replying, he displayed a long roll, which contained a list of the crimes charged against the pope, and which closed as follows:

"Being unable longer to suffer the rule of this priest of Cahors, who has proclaimed himself sovereign pontiff, supreme chief of kings and emperors, spiritual and temporal ruler of the world, we accuse him of having destroyed thou-

sands of innocent persons to seize their spoils, and of having made a tariff to insure impunity to all kinds of crime and debauchery. Finally, for the causes set forth in our declaration, we order his goods to be seized, and his person delivered up to our officers, and we prohibit all Christians from communing with him under penalty of being deprived of the fiefs which they hold of the empire."

A law was then proclaimed providing "that the pope should make Rome his place of residence, and should not remove from it without being authorized to do so by the people and clergy, and that in case he transgressed these rules, he should be deprived of the sovereign dignity, and be regarded as dead."

After this, the grand assembly, by order of the emperor, proceeded to the election of a pope to replace John XXII. The pope had proceeded so far as to organize a conspiracy in Italy for the assassination of Louis. The discovery of this plot prompted Louis to make a decree condemning the pontiff to death, and to proceed to the election of another chief of the Church. The venerable Peter Rainallucci, one of the brotherhood of Fratricellists, was accepted as pope by unanimous acclamation, and given the name of Nicholas V. And then the world saw the spectacle of two pontifical courts, one at Avignon, the other at Rome, lauching bulls of anathema against each other, and pursuing the partisans of each with diabolical extremity of ecclesiastical vengeance. Thus, whilst John was torturing two monks, guilty of having pronounced the name of Nicholas in their prayers, the prefect of Rome was burning a Tuscan and a Lombard for maintaining that John was the only lawful pope.

At length the treasury of the Roman pope became empty. He had neglected the usual resources of his predecessors for filling his coffers. Of course he was soon forsaken by his friends, and became very unpopular. The Avignon pope had plenty of gold to scatter about and subsidize the partisans of his rival. Armed bands entered the environs of Rome uttering menances against the anti-pope and the emperor. Louis

and Nicholas prudently fled from their palaces. They were pursued by a fanatical mob shouting, "Death to the heretics and the excommunicated! Long life to the sovereign pontiff, John XXII!"

The decrees of Louis and Nicholas were burnt on the public square; the Ghibelines were mercilessly massacred, and the buried bodies of Germans were disinterred and dragged through the streets. John wrote from Avignon, approving of these outrages, and returned solemn thanks to God for having answered his prayers by exterminating his enemies. Nicholas sent John the following letter of abdication:

"I heard brought against you and your court accusations of heresy, exactions, simony, debaucheries, and murders, which rendered you, in my eyes, the most execrable of pontiffs; I then thought it my duty not to refuse the tiara, in order to deliver the Church from a pope who was drawing the faithful into the abyss. I have since learned, from my own experience, how difficult it is to live a holy life in the chair of the apostle, and I avow that no one is more worthy of the papacy than yourself. I thus renounce this dignity, and will abdicate solemnly in your presence, in such place as you shall please to designate."

John not only swore to preserve his life in safety, with a pension sufficient for his wants, but in a letter of congratulation besought him to come to Rome and receive the recompense of his humility. Nicholas embarked in a galley belonging to John. But no sooner was he in the power of the pope's agents than he was submitted to the most cruel treatment. He was brought into Avignon in a secular dress and compelled to make an abjuration on a scaffold. The pope put a cord around his neck, led him around the public square, and, forcing him to prostrate himself with his forehead in the dust, placed his foot upon his head, and thundered forth a *Te Deum* as a mark of his victory. He was then thrown into a dungeon, where he lay for three years and a half. One morning the jailer who carried him scanty rations of bread and water found his dead body upon the threshold.

He had been strangled in the night. Thus perished another victim of John XXII.

After a few years, mostly occupied with quarrels with the surrounding powers, and launching letters of anathema against his enemies, John himself passed away. He died on the fourth of December, 1334, at the age of ninety. His reign had only resulted in wars and disasters. He had caused more than a thousand heretics to be burnt by his inquisitors, and extorted at least fifty millions of florins in gold from the people of Europe. After his death seven millions of florins' worth of crosses, mitres, and precious stones, besides eighteen millions of florins in coined money, were found in his treasury. This immense wealth was mostly the proceeds of the sale of indulgences. Some of the articles of his infamous code are here appended. These alone should be sufficient to secure for the popes the abhorrence of mankind, to say nothing of the list of crimes. Read them!

"If an ecclesiastic commits the sin of the flesh, whether with nuns, his cousins, nieces, goddaughters, or any other woman, he shall be absolved for the sum of sixty-seven francs, twelve sous.

"If, in addition to the sin of fornication, he asks for absolution from the sin against nature, or bestiality, he shall pay two hundred and nineteen francs, twelve sous. If, however, he has not committed this sin but with young men or beasts, and not with women, the fine shall be reduced to one hundred and thirty-one francs, fifteen sous.

"A priest who shall deflour a virgin shall pay two francs, eight sous.

"A nun who shall have abandoned herself to several men, simultaneously or in succession, in her monastery, and without it, and who shall wish to obtain the dignity of abbess, shall pay one hundred and thirty-one francs, fifteen sous.

"Priests, who shall wish to obtain authority to live in concubinage with their relatives shall pay seventy-six francs, one sou.

"For every sin of luxury committed by a layman, the absolution shall cost twenty-seven livres, one sou. For incest, four livres shall be added.

"An adulterous woman who desires absolution to place her beyond the reach of all pursuit, and to have a free dispensation to continue her guilty relations, shall pay to the pope eighty-seven francs, three sous. In a like case, a husband shall be submitted to the same tax. If they have committed incest with their children, they shall add six francs.

"Absolution and assurance against all pursuit, for the crimes of rapine, robbery, and incendiarism, shall cost the guilty one hundred and thirty-one francs, seven sous.

"Absolution for the simple murder of a layman is taxed at fifteen francs, four sous, eight deniers. If the assassin has slain several persons on the same day, he shall pay no more.

"A husband who shall have rudely struck his wife shall pay into the chancellery three francs, four sous. If he kills her, he shall pay seventeen francs, fifteen sous; if he has committed this crime to marry another woman, he shall pay besides thirty-two francs, nine sous. They who shall have assisted the husband in the murder shall be absolved on the payment of two francs a head.

"He who shall have murdered his child shall pay seventeen francs, fifteen sous. If the father and mother shall have slain their child by mutual consent, they shall pay twenty-seven francs, one sou for absolution.

"The woman who shall destroy her child in her womb, and the father who shall aid in the crime, shall each pay seventeen francs, fifteen sous. He who shall procure the abortion of a child of which he is not the father shall pay a franc less.

"For the murder of a brother, a sister, a mother, or a father, they shall pay seventeen francs, fifteen sous.

"He who shall slay a bishop or superior prelate shall pay one hundred and thirty-one francs, fourteen sous.

"If a murderer has slain several priests, in different encounters, he shall pay one hundred and thirty-seven francs, six

sous for the first assassination, and half of that for the rest.

"A bishop or an abbot who shall have committed murder by ambuscade, or through accident, or from necessity, shall pay one hundred and seventy-nine francs, fourteen sous for absolution.

"He who would buy absolution in advance for every accidental murder which he may in future commit, shall pay one hundred and sixty-eight francs, fifteen sous.

"A converted heretic shall pay two hundred and sixty-nine francs for his absolution. The son of a burned heretic, or one put to death by any other torture, shall not be reinstated until he has paid into the chancellery two hundred and eighteen francs, seventeen sous.

"An ecclesiastic who cannot pay his debts, and who wishes to avoid the pursuits of his creditors, shall give to the pope seventeen francs, nine sous, and his debts shall be remitted.

"Permission to open a store to sell different kinds of commodities beneath the portico of a church will be granted on the payment of forty-five francs, nineteen sous.

"For smuggling, and defrauding a prince of his dues, they shall pay eighty-seven francs.

"If a city demands permission for its inhabitants, priests, monks, and nuns, to eat food made of milk and meat, at forbidden seasons, it shall pay seven hundred and thirty-one francs, ten sous.

"If a monastery asks permission to change its rules, and to live in greater abstinence than before, it shall pay one hundred and forty-six francs, five sous.

"A virtuous monk, who desires to pass his life in a hermitage, shall pay into the treasury of the holy see forty-five francs, nineteen sous.

"An apostate vagabond, who wishes to reënter the pale of the Church, shall pay a like sum to be absolved.

"Monks and priests who desire to travel in secular garments shall be subjected to a like tax.

"The bastard of a curate who desires to do parochial duty

in the cure of his father shall pay twenty-seven francs, one sou.

"A bastard who desires to receive sacred orders, and to possess benefices, shall pay fifteen francs, nineteen sous.

"A foundling who shall desire to enter into sacred orders shall pay into the treasury of the pope twenty-seven francs, one sou.

"Lame or deformed laymen who shall wish to receive sacred orders, or to hold benefices, shall pay to the apostolic chancellery fifty-eight francs, two sous.

"One blind in the right eye shall pay a like sum; if he has lost his left, he shall give the pope one hundred and sixty francs, seven sous; those who squint shall pay forty-five francs, three sous.

"Eunuchs shall give the pope, for permission to enter into sacred orders, three hundred francs, fifteen sous.

"If a man wishes to acquire one or more benefices by simony, he shall apply to the treasury of the pope, who will sell him this right for a moderate price.

"He who shall desire to break his oath, and be guaranteed from all pursuit and all infamy, shall pay to the pope one hundred and thirty-one francs, fifteen sous. He shall pay three francs a head, besides, for those who shall have become his guarantees."

Such was the tax of the apostolic chancellery in the time of the infamous John XXII., and such was the tax which became for his successors one of the most vast and fruitful financial operations that the avarice and infernal genius of the pontiffs ever invented. Such a masterpiece of iniquity could only have sprung from the brain of a pope. It contains the secret of an institution which weighed down the sovereigns and people of Europe for nearly fifteen centuries. The reader can rely on the accuracy of the above-quoted articles from the damnable code. They are extracted from De Cormenin's "History of the Popes" (vol. ii., page 54). Let the language of a pious churchman, Conrad of Usperg, suffice as comment:

"O Vatican, rejoice now; all treasuries are open to thee: thou canst draw in with full hands! Rejoice in the crimes of the children of men, since thy wealth depends on their abandonment and iniquity. Urge on to debauchery, excite to rape, incest, even parricide; for the greater the crime, the more gold will it bring thee. Rejoice thou! Shout forth songs of gladness! Now the human race is subject to thy laws! Now thou reignest through depravity of morals and the inundation of ignoble thoughts. The children of men can now commit with impunity every crime, since they know that thou wilt absolve them for a little gold. Provided he brings thee gold, let him be soiled with blood and lust; thou wilt open the kingdom of heaven to debauchees, sodomites, assassins, parricides. What do I say? Thou wilt sell God himself for gold."

CLEMENT VI.

THE papal court was still at Avignon in 1343. In this year Benedict XII., after a reign of seven years, died, his body covered with hideous sores, the result of his years of licentious excesses and debaucheries. It was he who infamously violated and ruined Selvaggia, the young and beautiful sister of Petrarch, the famous Italian poet.

Upon the death of Benedict, the cardinals assembled in conclave and chose as sovereign pontiff the most corrupt and vile of all their number, Roger, cardinal of Nerea. He took the name of Clement VI. He was the son of Peter Roger, lord of Rosiere, who had caused him, when ten years of age, to enter an abbey at Auvergne. Upon arriving at manhood he left the convent and proceeded to Paris to finish his theological studies. He soon was made abbot of Fecamp, then bishop of Arras, and Benedict at last created him cardinal archbishop of Rouen. When he was proclaimed pope, he was leading so dissolute a life that he had been obliged to abandon his benefices to his numerous creditors; and he willingly entered into the plans of his cardinals for replenishing their depleted treasury. The sales of apostolic offices and indulgences were carried on as they had never been before; and the revenues derived therefrom, together with the millions acquired by the confiscation of the property of heretics, not only repaired the fallen fortunes of this blessed turnkey of heaven, but enabled him to supply the enormous expenses of his mistresses and minions. He was not only immoral and depraved but he gloried in his wickedness and licentiousness. Courtesans, prostitutes, and pages entered his sleeping chamber in the presence of all, and the chamberlain of the palace

waited upon them while in the very arms of this shepherd of the fold of Christ. The clergy of Avignon became so depraved that the most insignificant among them considered himself dishonored if he had not about him several girls of a dissolute life.

Clement was as ambitious of temporal power was as any of his predecessors. When Robert of Naples died, leaving his kingdom to his granddaughter, Joanna, a mere child, too young to conduct the affairs of state, Clement immediately determined to seize upon Naples and convert its immense revenues to his own use. He published a bull declaring that the kingdom of Naples had emanated from the holy see, and that it should revert to it again until the majority of Joanna, which he fixed at twenty-five years. He then sent a cardinal in the capacity of apostolic vicar to seize upon the reins of government, and, taking the young queen under his own care, confided her education to some depraved females of his selection who would be sure to make her as dissolute as themselves.

Having, by his audacious villainy, made himself master of Naples, he next turned his attention to Germany, and lighted the fires of civil war in that country. It mattered not that millions of lives might be sacrificed, the policy of the Church of the Prince of Peace must be carried out. All nations must be governed by the Church, though there remained but smouldering ruins to govern. If Clement could not obtain possession of Germany, he was determined to sow the seeds of discord there, that he might, at least, rejoice at its misgovernment by others. His emissaries distributed gold freely, and induced the cities of Italy still remaining faithful to Louis of Bavaria to revolt. He then caused the bulls which John XXII. had fulminated against the emperor to be again proclaimed in Germany, France, England, and the whole Roman peninsula, and, to add new force to them, appended this imprecation: "May the divine wrath—may the anger of St. Peter and St. Paul light on Louis of Bavaria, in this world and in the next. May the earth engulf him alive. May the

elements be adverse to him, and his children perish before his eyes, massacred by the hands of his enemies."

Philip of France, upon whom the pope depended for support, was threatened by Louis that if Clement proceeded further in his designs France would be held responsible. Philip, fearing the arms of the Germans, immediately notified Clement that if he did not desist he would withdraw all support from the holy see. Fear of losing his most powerful ally forced the pontiff to abandon his plans, for the time being, against the German empire; and he next turned his attention to England. He distributed the benefices of that kingdom among his favorite cardinals, whose revenues were not sufficient to maintain the luxury of their establishments: he granted to them the richest abbeys, the best churches, and the wealthiest dioceses, and also gave them authority to send agents into Great Britain to take possession of them in their name, that they might spend the revenues at his court. But King Edward did not tamely submit to these papal impositions; and his officers drove off the French priests who went to take possession of the benefices for the cardinals.

Clement's letter to Edward upon this resistance to the authority of the holy see is a good sample of the arrogant claims of the Church at that time—claims that have remained unchanged to this day, though the nations ignore them now, and the Church is powerless to enforce them. The letter of Clement is as follows:

"We have learned, my son, that you have published edicts which tend to destroy ecclesiastical liberty, the primacy of the Roman Church, and the authority of the holy see. You cannot be ignorant that Jesus Christ himself gave to the apostles and their successors authority to govern the world. You know that, by virtue of this power, the popes have founded patriarchal churches, cathedrals, and secondary churches, and have established the hierarchy of the clergy. For many ages there has been no change. The full and entire disposal of ecclesiastical honors, dignities, and wealth has always pertained to the popes. You have, then, rendered

yourself guilty of a great sin by authorizing the persecutions against the agents of our cardinals, and by hindering the executions of our favors. We now send you our internuncios, Nicholas, the metropolitan of Ravenna, and Peter, bishop of Astorga, with powers to assemble a council which shall abolish every edict or declaration contrary to our authority, and who will pronounce an anathema against you if your officers or people refuse us obedience."

The letter to Edward was no more successful than the bull against Louis. Edward replied to the pope that he was scandalized by seeing the wealth of his kingdom at the mercy of the court of Avignon; that "shepherds should cherish their lambs, and not shear nor slay them; that this work appertained to kings, and that for the future he would dispose of the ecclesiastical benefices as William the Conquerer had done."

France alone remained true to the pontiff, and acknowledged his right of sovereignty over the kingdoms of the earth. In the beginning of the year 1344 another effort was made to bring about a reconciliation between the German emperor and Clement; but the conditions offered by the pope were so humiliating that they were immediately declined by the German emperor. Among them was the following: "The emperor shall make an edict to subject to the punishment of fire those of his subjects who shall refuse to recognize that the empire is a benefice of the pope."

Upon the refusal of the Germans to submit to these cruel and pretentious terms as the basis of a treaty, the pope determined to resort to intrigue. He commenced secret negotiations with a prince of the house of Luxemburg; with John, king of Bohemia; with Charles, marquis of Moravia; and with Baldwin, archbishop of Treves, to assure himself of vengeance. But his attention was diverted to his royal ward, Joanna. Though she was nominally queen of Naples, the power of the kingdom was in the hands of the cardinal Aimeric, legate of the pope; so she was left to occupy herself in pleasure and debauchery, and to put in practice those

lessons of depravity which she had received from the favorites of the pope. Says De Cormenin:

"Though she had scarcely attained her sixteenth year, she deserved to be compared to a Messalina. She had already received into the royal couch the lords of the court, simple guards, and even sailors of the port. Her husband, Andrew, enervated by her lascivious caresses, and unable longer to respond to her desires, excited her hatred, and he was found one morning cast from the window of his bed-room, after having been strangled with a cord of silk."

The crime of Joanna excited so great an indignation among the sovereigns of Europe that it was determined to avenge the death of Andrew. She perceived this, and hastened to write to Louis of Hungary, her brother-in-law, to free herself from the suspicion of having murdered her husband. She received only doubtful replies to her letters, and she soon learned that Louis, at the head of a powerful army, was coming to avenge his brother. In this extremity, she sought the protection of one of her lovers, her cousin Louis of Tarentum, whom she married. But the protection of her new husband availed her nothing. The Hungarians seized on her capital, and Joanna was compelled to take refuge in Avignon, which then belonged to the kingdom of Naples. Clement received her favorably, and soon experienced a violent passion for her, and she became his mistress.

The pontiff at once openly declared himself the protector of Joanna. He praised the innocence, mildness, and purity of the queen in presence of the embassadors of all the Christian princes assembled in consistory, launched terrible bulls against her enemies, and threatened the Hungarian king with ecclesiastical thunders if he did not retire at once from Naples. The young king was thus compelled to forego his vengeance and return to his kingdom. Joanna returned in triumph to her capital, and plunged anew into such excesses that her court was only equaled in depravity by that of the sovereign pontiff.

Clement now returned to the attack on Louis of Bavaria

with more audacity than before. He published a bull against that king, denounced him as infamous and a heretic, and declared him deposed. Rome at this time was in the possession of Germany, and the first step of the pope was to separate it from that empire. In order to accomplish this, he instructed the cardinals, assembled in consistory, to choose a king for the Romans. But as the cardinals had received large sums to sustain the interests of different pretenders, there resulted a division which almost proved fatal to the pontiff. "At first they abused each other vehemently: then from words they came to blows; the officers and domestics then took the part of their masters, and the melee became general. Several prelates received severe wounds, and the pope himself had a shoulder put out of joint by the blow of a club" (De Cormenin). It appears that clubs played an important part in the discussions of the councils and consistories of the Church in those days. After the dislocation of the shoulder of this vicegerent of God, peace was again restored, and the favorite of the pope, Charles of Luxemburg, who had made more magnificent promises than any of his rivals, was chosen king of the Romans.

This election was confirmed by a bull, in which Clement declared that God had given to the popes supreme power over the celestial kingdom and the empires of the earth. Some months afterwards, Louis of Bavaria died of poison, but whether administered by the pope or Charles, the newly-elected king of the Romans, was never discovered. Charles was now recognized as king of the Romans, but he exercised no influence over Germany. The high Germanic aristocracy possessed the real power, and the new Cæsar had to content himself with the insignia of royalty.

The condition of the Romans was not changed for the better by the new order of things. Though they no longer had the pope amongst them, his court was well represented. The papal minions still exercised their heaven-given power in tyrannizing over the unfortunate citizens of Rome. They pillaged their property, violated their wives and daughters,

and murdered them without pity. Even the poor were not beyond the reach of their cruelty.

Nicholas Rienzi, a young student, was moved at so deplorable a state of affairs, and he swore implacable hatred to those tyrants. He induced the citizens to send a deputation to the pope to entreat him to cause a change in the conduct of his representatives in Rome. But the greedy and debauched pontiff was too busily engaged in extending his sway and increasing his wealth to attend to the prayers of the suffering Romans. Seeing all hopes of redress from the pontiff to be vain, Rienzi, by his persuasive eloquence, induced his fellow-Romans to make a bold stroke for liberty, and on the twentieth of May, 1347, the republic was proclaimed, without bloodshed or tumult. Rienzi was conducted to the capital, and the title of Tribune and Liberator of Rome decreed to him.

Rienzi saw the necessity of exercising great prudence in his new position. He established order in the city, drove forth the depraved minions of the pope, and Rome rejoiced in a short season of peace and plenty. The different sovereigns of Europe accepted the situation, and received the embassadors of the republic respectfully, and even sought the friendship of the tribune; and Rienzi, the son of an Italian innkeeper, became greater than kings and emperors.

Clement, fearing the rivalry of so great and dangerous a power—the power of a free people—resolved to destroy it in its infancy. He launched a terrible anathema against the tribune, declared him to be a heretic, excommunicated him, annulled the acts of his government, and interdicted him the use of fire and water. Emissaries of the pope distributed gold among the viler classes of people, organized a conspiracy, placed the count of Minerbino at their head, and introduced into the city a troop of banditti, who proclaimed a revolution. Rienzi attempted to call the citizens to arms, but he found the vantage points in possession of the insurgents. The agents of the pontiff had done their duty well. Money ruled the masses; treason was everywhere, and Reinzi,

to escape death, was forced to flee from Rome in the disguise of a monk, alone, and without resources. He took refuge with the king of Bohemia, who basely surrendered him to Clement. Fortunately for the fallen Rienzi a terrible plague, which had fallen upon Europe, suspended operations for his punishment and saved his life. The city of Avignon was decimated, and Rienzi escaped from the greedy pontiff, whose attention was absorbed in gathering to his coffers the spoils of a large number of rich ecclesiastics who had fallen victims to the prevailing epidemic.

During all this time since the poisoning of Louis of Bavaria, Charles, the pet of the pope and nominal king of Rome, had been endeavoring to improve his position and to gain possession of the imperial crown of Germany. But his pretensions were ignored by the nobles and electors of that empire, who elected Gunther of Schwartzenburg, to mount the throne. Upon being proclaimed emperor, he issued the following edict, which shows the feelings of the Germans of that time toward the holy see:

"Our predecessor, Louis of Bavaria, of glorious memory, who died a victim to the perfidy of the pontifical court, made a law which declared him master of the empire who shall have obtained the majority of the votes of the electors. By the advice of our ecclesiastical and secular princes, we confirm this law, filled with wisdom. We also declare every act contrary to it, and all decrees made since by the pontiffs, null and void, as departing from the apostolic doctrine, which orders priests to be submissive to Cæsar."

Such a protest against the pretensions of the holy see must necessarily deserve divine punishment. Accordingly a judgment of God was visited upon him, and a few days afterward the unfortunate Gunther died of poison.

As this was about the time of the new jubilee, the year 1350, the pope, being anxious to attract a multitude of the faithful to Rome, issued a bull exciting the simple believers to come to obtain plenary indulgences granted to pilgrims. The crowds of fanatics who flocked to Rome in response to

this bull exceeded those of any previous jubilee, reaching as high as six hundred thousand. The pope had instructed Annibal Cecano, his legate, to collect the offerings which this crowd of deluded beings should deposit upon the tomb of St. Peter, the objective point of their pilgrimage. But the cardinal legate, partaking of the pope's rapacity and greed, determined to profit by the opportunity and fill his own private coffers. He commenced business on his own account by selling indulgences to the pilgrims which permitted them to reap all the spiritual benefits to be derived from their pilgrimage after a shorter sojourn in the city than would otherwise have been necessary. The inhabitants, who, partaking of the general greed, had converted their houses into hotels for the accommodation of the pilgrims, and who had lost money as landlords in proportion as the prelate gained by the sales of his indulgences, bitterly opposed his traffic, attacked his palace several times, and killed some of his people.

But the traffic in dispensations and indulgences did not cease, nor even relax, so great was the faith of the pilgrims. At the end of the year Cecano left Rome for Avignon followed by fifty wagons strongly guarded, and loaded with gold and silver, the pope's share of the spoils. Clement himself had not been idle all this time. He sold indulgences and dispensations to kings, princes, and lords who did not care to visit Rome. Altogether the jubilee of 1350 brought incalculable wealth to the papal court.

The sect called the Flagellants, who had been persecuted and almost exterminated by pope Alexander IV., reappeared during this period of fanaticism. These devotees, whose religious duties consisted in flagellating themselves in public while perfectly nude, penetrated even to Avignon; and a party of them performed their penance in the presence of the cardinals and the pontiff. Two of the female penitents appeared so beautiful to the holy Father in their nudity that he caused them to be carried off and confined in his palace for his own use. Their fellow-penitents became furious at this outrage, and demanded, at the door of the papal palace,

that the prisoners be set at liberty. In response to their entreaties, this merciful Father ordered his guards to charge and massacre them, and fulminated a terrible anathema against the entire sect, and enjoined his bishops to hand them over to the inquisitors wherever caught, and to punish them with fire if they refused to abjure. While endeavoring to exterminate the Flagellants, he was fostering and defending the mendicant monks, whose depravity excited general indignation. Those monks had multiplied to such an alarming extent that they were a curse to Europe. They had despoiled the dying during the pestilence, and pillaged their houses, and had been guilty of the most shameless debaucheries with prostitutes during the general calamity. But they were the chief defenders of the papal power, and they were numerous as an army.

When these pestiferous wretches were accused before this infallible agent of the Almighty, he replied to the accusers as follows:

"Let us not judge these poor monks too severely because they have appropriated to themselves some money whilst attending on those who were afflicted with the pestilence. . . . I, who am infallible, declare them to be absolved from all the sins they have committed; and I even authorize them to retain the nuns who inhabit their convents, that they may multiply and increase the population decimated by the late scourge."

As the year 1352 drew to a close Clement lay sick with a fever. The physician pronouncing his malady incurable, his faith in his own infallibility appeared to fade, and he published a bull containing the following avowal:

"If, since we have been elevated to the papacy, we have advanced in our writings or language propositions contrary to religion or morals, we revoke them and submit them to the correction of our successor."

On the next day, in reply to this bull, the following letter was circulated in Avignon:

"Beelzebub, Prince of Darkness, to Pope Clement, his Vicar: Your mother, Pride, salutes you; your sisters,

Knavery, Avarice, and Shamelessness, and your brothers, Incest, Robbery, and Murder, thank you for having caused them to prosper. Given from the centre of Hell amid the acclamations of a troop of demons, and in the presence of two hundred damned popes, who wait your presence with impatience."

Clement died on the sixth of December, 1352, and his remains were deposited in the abbey of Chaise-Dieu, where he had been a monk.

According to the historians of the times, the court of Avignon, under this last pontificate, was the receptacle of every vice and the most terrible depravity. Petrarch has left us the following description of it:

"Who would not by turns smile with pity or feel indignation in seeing these decrepid cardinals and prelates, with their white hair and their ample togas, beneath which are concealed an impudence, and lasciviousness which nothing equals? These libidinous dotards are so forgetful of age and the priesthood as to fear neither dishonor nor opprobrium; they consume their last days in every kind of excess of libertinage. These unworthy priests think to arrest time, which drags them along, and believe themselves young in their old age, because their shamelessness and intemperance urge them on to saturnalia which are repugnant to youth. Thus Satan himself with his infernal laugh, presides over their debauches, and places himself between the virgin objects of their nauseous amours and these old cacochymes, who become irritated at constantly finding their strength less than their lubricity."

INNOCENT VI.

Stephen Aubert was born near the small city of Pompadour in France. Apart from his ecclesiastical career his life presents nothing of interest. He was appointed Professor and Doctor of civil law at Toulouse, and afterwards became one of the principal magistrates of that city. In 1337 he was raised to the bishopric of Noyon. He was soon after made cardinal bishop of Ostia and grand penitentiary by Clement VI. This pontiff died on the sixth of December, 1352; and six days after, the conclave of cardinals assembled in the pontifical palace to proceed to the election of a new pope. The venerable John de Birelle, the general of the Chartreux, was first proposed; but he was almost unanimously rejected, the cardinals declaring that they would not have an humble, chaste, and rigidly moral man govern the Church. They then took the precaution of adopting decrees which should fortify them against an unwise choice and counterpoise the power of a good pope. After having thus well guaranteed themselves against the encroachments of papal authority, they fixed their choice for next pope on Stephen Aubert. He was subjected to the usual proof, and, after the customary ceremony of consecration, was enthroned by the name of Innocent VI. The day after his election he proceeded to perjure himself by repealing the rules published by the cardinals, and which he himself had solemnly sworn to observe.

To render full justice to Innocent it must be said that at the beginning of his reign he seemingly sought to correct some of the scandalous privileges and abuses of the cardinals and clergy. His efforts were chiefly directed against the

apostolic toleration of prostitutes at the court of Rome and the system of taxation which John XXII. had established for incest, murder, parricide, and all kinds of crime.

After what has been related of the popes, the reader will see the propriety of making particular mention of, and giving particular credit for, any manifestation of morality that may appear in the life of any of their number. But his worthy actions were not such as to glorify him, neither were they of long duration. He soon became a persecuting fanatic, and startled Christendom by his severity. He pursued heretics with the most frightful punishments. The Fratricelli were especial objects of his insane cruelty. One of their number, John of Chatillon, whose punishment afforded a spectacle to the pontifical court, defied the rage of his executioners, and, amidst the torments of the flames, cried out to the people: "Christians, my brethren, I declare in the presence of God, who judges us, that you are the dupes of the knavery of the pope; in the name of my salvation, I affirm that John XXII., Benedict XII., Clement VI., and Innocent VI. are all the enemies of God—simoniacs, forgers, robbers, murderers, and heretics." Some of the old chroniclers cite as a proof of the pontiff's goodness of heart that he did not cause the fire of the stake to be extinguished, to recommence torturing the palpitating members of the heretic.

About this time Charles IV. was crowned emperor of Germany. He at once sent to Innocent for permission to come and receive the crown of gold in the church of St. Peter, which was granted him under very humiliating conditions. The emperor first entered Milan with naked feet, and received the iron crown from the metropolitan of that city; he then went to Rome, with the princess Anne, his wife, in the dress of a pilgrim. On the day of his arrival he was solemnly crowned emperor by Peter Bertrandi, cardinal bishop of Ostia. He left Rome immediately after having given his imperial pledge to remain but one day in the imperial city. Of this act of humiliation and subserviency, the indignant Petrarch wrote to him as follows: "Where will you conceal

your ignomony, prince? What! you have promised, and promised under oath, to remain but a single day in Rome! What glory for a bishop thus to humiliate a sovereign, who ought to be the protector of liberty! How proud should he be at seeing you cringe beneath his feet! What more ignominious for an emperor than to be trampled under foot by an audacious priest, and to be content with the title of Cæsar without daring to inhabit his residence? Go to; you are fit to live in Avignon, that city which is the sink and the receptacle of all the vices!

"I can speak of it, for I know its abominations. In that third Babylon, which has no equal but Rome, there exists no pity, no charity, no faith, no fear of God; there is nothing there holy, sacred, honest, humane; in a word, shame, charity, and candor are banished from it; as for truth, it never entered it. How could it exist in a place where everything is false? The air, the earth, the houses, the palaces, the streets, the markets, the temples, the chambers, the beds, the angles of the walls, the hotels, the seats of the judges, the pontifical throne, and the altars consecrated to God, all are peopled by knaves and liars. In this infernal labyrinth of frightful dungeons, or sombre prisons, commands an imperious minor, who agitates, in a fatal urn, the lot of mortals. At the least signal from his master, a minotaur, under the form of a priest, casts himself upon the victims, and drags them into the temples of the shameless Venus. No! truth could not show itself in that infamous place without being violated. Unhappy, thrice unhappy, would be the candid man who should hazard himself in that abyss of vices; he would find neither fidelity nor sincere friends, nor a second Ariadne who could give him a thread by which he might extricate himself from this inextricable labyrinth. In this city the Elysian fields, Styx, and Acheron are regarded as ridiculous fables; a future life, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the end of the world, and the final judgment are regarded as tales and idle stories; in a word, the salvation of the human family lies in gold; it is

gold alone which can appease the monster, enchain him, make him smile. With gold, you may deflour your sisters, murder your father; with gold, you can open heaven, buy the saints, the angels, the virgin, the Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ, and the eternal Father himself; the pope will sell you everything for gold except his tiara."

This letter produced its effect upon the emperor. He hastened home to Germany to allay the discontent which his submission to the pope had excited. All the way along his journey he was painfully reminded of the justice of Petrarch's reproaches. Upon his arrival at Pisa the people rose and sought to set fire to the palace in which he had taken refuge. Several officers of his household were hung, and he had to escape by night with his wife and the remains of his court. Most of the cities refused to open their gates to him. Charles saw the mistake he had made, and the sad consequences of his humiliating submission to the Roman see. But he at once set about making amends for his weakness.

Although a weak man, Charles had the qualities of a capable sovereign. Upon his return to his kingdom he governed with wisdom, and established peace and prosperity throughout his provinces. He refused payment of the new subsidies the pontiff levied upon his provinces. Innocent immediately sent his nuncio into Germany to take possession of the vacant benefices, with power to excommunicate and denounce to the tribunals of the Inquisition all who should oppose the execution of his orders. The cupidity of the pope created general discontent. Preachers condemned the conduct of the head of the Church, and called down the vengeance of heaven on the court of Rome. The following is from the last sermon of John of Rochtaillade, preached at Avignon:

"In times past an extraordinary bird was born into the world; it was large, strong, and had no feathers. The other birds having heard of this phenomenon, went in crowds to the place where it was born, to admire it; but as soon as they saw this poor being trembling with cold, dying with hunger, and incapable of seeking its food—since it could not fly—they

took pity on it, and agreed that each should pluck out some feathers to cover the unfortunate; this was readily done. As soon as this bird found himself covered with plumage shining with purple and gold, he became proud and arrogant, and treated with contempt the birds who had so generously despoiled themselves for him; he soon even pretended to have sprung from the eagle of Jupiter, and wished to subdue his benefactors; he attacked them, one after another, and pursued them into all countries, to devour them. At last the birds, worn out with his tyranny, assembled in council, and decided to fall all at once on their tyrant and tear his plumage from him. The peacock, vulture, and owl commenced the attack—the others followed; and the phenomenon bird, despoiled in a moment of the feathers which had been given to him, died of hunger on the very spot in which the birds had first found him. Thus will it happen to you, pope and cardinals," said the orator, turning towards the tribunal of the pontifical court, "when the people shall have taken back the wealth they gave you." On quitting the stand brother John was arrested, handed over to the inquisitors, who burnt him as a heretic.

Soon after, on the twelfth of December, 1362, Innocent VI. died. He had lived to a very advanced age. He was buried in the cathedral at Avignon.

URBAN VI.

THE seventy years' captivity in Babylon (as the residence of the popes at Avignon has been called by way of derision) had greatly weakened the power of the papacy in the fourteenth century. Upon the accession of Clement V. to the popedom, the court of the holy see had been removed from Rome, the ancient seat of ghostly grandeur, to Avignon, in France. From the new capital, Clement and his successors terrified Christendom for seventy years with their bulls and interdicts. The death of Gregory XI., in 1378, gave rise to the great Western schism, which for fifty years turned Europe upside down. This is one of the most important events in the history of popery. In Germany, France, Spain, and Italy, the respective rights of the popes of Rome or Avignon were defended by force of arms. These infallible heads of the Church excommunicated and denounced each other, each revealing the criminal turpitude of his rival, and reciprocally accusing each other of incest and murder, sacrilege, simony, and sodomy. History has never decided which of them were the true successors of St. Peter; and as, in the course of their reigns, they were rivals in crimes and outrages, it is difficult to decide which of them were the most infamous and best deserved the title of pope.

The inspired college of cardinals in the conclave to elect a successor to Gregory had become divided on the question whether a Frenchman or an Italian should be elected as the vicar of Christ. They had been conducted to the chamber of conclave in the Vatican by a strong escort by order of the magistrates of the city. "Death or an Italian pope," shouted an infuriated mob of thirty thousand Romans as it raged

around the Vatican and made preparation for burning any of the cardinals who should vote for a French candidate. At this moment a fearful storm swept over the city. A thunderbolt fell among the conclave, overturning the table of the secretary, breaking the doors of the chambers, and lighting up with its sinister light a picture which filled the cardinals with terror. In an immense gallery surrounding the conclave, the chiefs of the quarters and the bannerets, at the head of their armed men, were ranged in order of battle; behind them were the soldiery, shaking the floors and walls with blows of pikes and halberds; they also saw before the Vatican an immense scaffold with fagots of vine branches and dry reeds to burn them alive.

The members of the sacred college saw that their only choice was between martyrdom and the nomination of an Italian pope. Their choice fell upon Bartholomew Prignano, a Neapolitan by birth, and the archbishop of Bare. Amid the ominous peals of the cathedral bells and the threatening clamor of the mob, Prignano was selected as the successor of St. Peter, by the name of Urban VI. The intimidated cardinals presented him to the turbulent populace with the usual declaration that they had been inspired in their election by the influence of the Holy Ghost. Disguising their mortification under the warmest pledges of friendship and allegiance, all but four of the cardinals then retired to Fondi, excommunicated the newly-elected vicar of Christ, and elected Clement VII. in his place. This action exasperated Urban. He vowed an implacable hatred to the French; he removed them from his court, and publicly called them sodomites, heretics, and robbers. By such actions he alienated the prelates from him. He next exasperated the officers of the treasury against himself by causing a collector of the apostolic chamber to be flogged unmercifully for not having brought back money enough from a tour through the provinces.

Tired of the tyranny of Urban, the cardinals on the return of summer obtained permission to leave Rome and go to Anagni. The day after their arrival they were joined by the

cardinal camerlingo, who brought with him the tiara, the apostolic ring, the keys of St. Peter, and other pontifical ornaments. They then declared the election of Urban null, and procured troops to protect the sacred college whilst they proceeded to another election. Urban attempted to arrest the march of the troops. He was defeated in the fight. He then turned all his anger against the inhabitants of Rome for not having prevented the march of the guard. He ordered a general massacre of the people. Neither age nor sex was spared. Old men, women, and children were mercilessly murdered, and several bishops were assassinated in the chamber of Urban, where they had taken refuge to implore his pity. Upon the news of this butchery, the cardinals addressed the following manifesto to all the powers of Europe:

"We have already informed you of the fury of the Roman people and their leaders, as well as the violence done to us by forcing us to choose an Italian pope whom the Holy Spirit had not chosen. A multitude, carried away by fanaticism, wrested from us the temporary appointment of an apostate, a murderer, a heretic soiled with every crime; he himself had recognized that his election was to be only provisional. In contempt of his oath, he, however, compelled us by threats of death, to elevate him to the chair of the apostle, and to cover his proud forehead with the triple crown. Now that we are beyond the reach of his anger, we declare him to be an intruder, usurper, and antichrist; we pronounce an anathema against him and those who shall submit to his authority."

Urban made no reply. He treacherously sought to negotiate a peace with them that he might afterwards destroy them. Otho of Brunswick and Joanna of Naples, his wife, sent embassadors to the insurgents to propose to them, in the name of the holy Father, to enter into conference in order to conclude some arrangement. The cardinals listened favorably to these overtures, and sent three of their number to Rome, who came with the envoys of Joanna to beseech the pope to submit to the chances of a new election. At this demand Urban became furious, spoke grossly of the queen,

and wrote a violent letter to her, in which he not only recalled one of her murders and her debauchery with his predecessors, Clement VI. and Urban V., but even threatened to divulge her crimes and excommunicate her and her fourth husband. This rupture between the courts of Rome and Naples was useful to the French cardinals, and procured for them the protection of Queen Joanna, who even offered them the city of Fondi, in which they could proceed, without fear, to the election of a chief of the Church.

The latter accepted the residence which was offered them, and were engaged at once in forming a conclave; as, however, they had no Italian prelates among them, and as they were fearful lest, in consequence of it, the cardinals of that nation would desire to annul the election, under pretext that they had not concurred in it, they determined to renew the expedient employed by Philip, count of Poitiers, after the death of Clement V; that is, by writing to three of the partisans of Urban, to induce them to come to the conclave by leading them each to hope that the choice of his colleagues would fall on him. This ruse succeeded perfectly; the three cardinals hastened to Fondi and took part in the ballot. They were not long in discovering they had been tricked, for on counting the votes, Robert of Geneva, a cardinal priest of the order of the Twelve Apostles, was proclaimed chief of the Church, and enthroned by the name of Clement VII.

Three days after his election the new pope came to Avignon to be consecrated. The joyful news was spread among the courts of Europe. Clement VII. was thirty-six years old at this time. His manners were those of an emperor, and he treated with royal luxury the dukes, lords, and embassadors who were admitted to his table. In fact, luxuriousness was his principal vice. Bishops and cardinals, one after another, left Rome to attach themselves to the new pontiff. The Vatican was soon deserted. This afflicted Urban to tears. To supply the vacant places he was obliged to create twenty-nine new cardinals. But he was still recognized as the lawful pope in Germany, Hungary, England, Poland, Bohemia, Den-

mark, Sweden, Prussia, Norway, Holland, Tuscany, Lombardy, and the duchy of Milan. Spain and France managed to maintain a neutrality. Embassadors of the rival popes met at the council of Toledo, and reciprocally accused each other of such enormities that the prelates and lords declared that the two pretenders were both infamous priests, and that they would recognize neither of them as head of the Church. A synod composed of the clergy, doctors, and the principal lords of France declared that both Urban and Clement were unworthy of the tiara. Clement afterwards succeeded in winning the king, Charles V., over to the side of Avignon. Charles convoked another council at Vincennes, which recognized Clement as the supreme pontiff. Lorraine, Savoy, Scotland, Navarre, Arragon, and Castile followed the example of France.

And now commenced a fearful fight between the two popes. Anathemas, interdicts, and maledictions were the prelude to the bloody strife which soon swept over the western nations. Urban launched a bull against his competitor, and cited him to appear before the court of Rome to be judged and condemned as antipope. On his side, Clement fulminated a terrible decree against his enemy, and cited him before the consistory of Avignon to be judged for his usurpation of the apostolical chair. They continued to curse each other by the ringing of bells and the light of torches, declaring each other apostates, schismatics, and heretics; they preached crusades against each other, and let loose the malefactors and banditti of Italy and France upon each other and the unfortunate inhabitants who recognized them. The Clementists made horrid havoc in the States of the Church. Fire and pillage and desolation marked their pathway. Under the command of a Breton captain, they proceeded as far as Rome, seized the fortress of San Angelo, and perpetrated atrocities in all parts of the city. Under the leading of an English freebooter, the Urbanists took their revenge by making reprisal and ravaging Romagna and the provinces of their papal foe. Half of Europe was filled with rape and pillage, incendiarism and murder, in the name of these pretended vicars of Jesus

Christ. The peaceful peasants were slaughtered by wholesale, and the dead bodies of thousands of men and women lay unburied in the fields. Once magnificent provinces presented only a spectacle of ruined crops and castles and smouldering cities.

At length the leader of the Clementists was taken prisoner, and the devastation was arrested for a time. The triumphant Urban then proceeded to launch a terrible anathema against the queen of Naples for having refused to furnish men and money during the war. He declared her a heretic, confiscated her property, and ordered the inquisitors to burn her alive. To carry out this sentence he induced Louis of Hungary to send a powerful army into Italy; and in order to meet the expenses of the expedition he sold the furniture of his palace and the domains of the Church; he even converted into money the crosses and chalices, the sacred vases and shrines of the saints. Naples was seized and Joanna forced to surrender. Some historians state that she was stabbed on the steps of the altar while at prayers. Others say that her captor, Charles de Duras, inflicted frightful cruelties on her; that he tore out her breasts and her womb, and strangled her with a silken cord, as she had done her husband. This victory prompted Urban to prosecute with renewed zeal his projects of revenge against his enemies. The following bull against the king of Castile and Leon will illustrate the spirit by which he was actuated:

"In thy turn be accursed, John Henriquez; thou who daredst to declare thyself king of Castile without our approval. We condemn thee to be burned as a heretic, and we prohibit thy subjects, under penalty of being handed over to our redoubtable Inquisition, from affording thee aid and assistance. We order them to track thee as a wild beast, and we will grant infinite recompense in this world and the next to him who shall deliver thee up dead or alive; finally, we command all the people of Christendom to take the cross to exterminate thee with the execrable antipope, Robert of Geneva."

Theodoric de Neim, one of the great dignitaries of the court of Urban, gives, in his history, graphic accounts of the fiendish cruelty exercised by Urban upon the persons of such of his enemies as he could get within his power. Upon one occasion he dared to petition the pope on behalf of some unfortunate prisoners. "'No pardon for them,' said he, in a loud tone, 'and let their defenders dread my wrath!' He then rose and left the council, leaning on his nephew, to whom we heard him say, 'Come, Butillo, let us go and see our enemies tortured.'" The series of frightful tortures which then commenced is thus described by De Cormenin:

"The victims, led into a place situated behind the castle, were handed over to the executioners, despoiled of their garments, and beaten with rods. This punishment not appearing to the holy Father to be severe enough, Butillo, his nephew, undertook to carry on the executions himself. The unfortunate men were at once placed on the rack, and new tortures were applied to them. An archbishop, who had formerly remonstrated with Butillo on his bad conduct, was, by order of that monster, fastened to the trunk of a tree, with his head down, and flayed alive; the archbishop of Venice was nailed to a cross, and an old Genoese pirate, a worthy minister to the cruelties of Urban, staunched with salt and vinegar the blood which flowed from his wounds; a deacon was hung to a plane tree, with enormous weights attached to his feet and hands, to dislocate his members; the Cardinal Sangro had his flesh torn from him with red-hot pincers; and as, notwithstanding his sufferings, he continued to protest his innocence, they exhausted upon him all the refinements of cruelty, until fatigue constrained them to stop. Another cardinal was fastened to the rack, and burned with a red-hot iron on his breast, arms, and legs; after which, his tormentors tore out his nose, tongue, and eyes, and broke his limbs with iron bars; and to finish him, Butillo caused three chafing-dishes to be lighted under the sufferer, to burn him at a slow fire. Whilst these frightful executions were proceeding, the pope was promenading in an adjoining alley,

reciting his breviary in a loud voice, and stopping, from time to time, to encourage the executioners to do their duty."

Returning from his crusade against his enemies, Urban arrived at the port of Genoa on the twenty-third of September, 1385. The victims of his vengeance were sent on shore during the night, and plunged in the dungeons of the chief inquisitor. In vain did the magistrates of the republic, and even the clergy, sue for their pardon. The holy Father was inflexible, and, to put an end to their entreaties, he instructed Butillo, a wretch soiled with every crime, whom the pope had raised to the rank of prince, to put them to death. This worthy creature of such a master acquitted himself admirably of his cruel mission, even surpassing all his former cruelties. He caused the Cardinal Louis Donato, to be interred in a bed of quick-lime, leaving his head out of this infernal tomb, that he might feel his flesh all corrode and consume before his death. He shut up wolves in the dungeon of St. Bartholomew, to devour him alive, and Gentil de Sangro and Martin del Guidice were sewed up in bags of leather with serpents and then cast into the sea. An English cardinal, Adam Easton, was alone spared, thanks to the remonstrances of the embassadors of his nation, who threatened the pope with the wrath of King Richard if he dared to condemn to death one of the subjects of Great Britain. Urban contented himself with breaking both his legs. His cruelties, performed in cold blood, exasperated the minds of men. Ecclesiastics who had hitherto shown devotion to his party, abandoned him. The metropolitan of Ravenna and Garléot Tarlat de Pietra Mala publicly burned their cardinal's hats and started for Avignon.

Urban continued his career of crime. The French seized on Naples, and established the authority of Clement. While on his way to lower Italy to dispute the kingdom with his competitor, Urban met with a serious fall from his horse, which compelled him to suspend his operations. He was obliged to return to Rome with his troops. A few days after entering the Vatican he yielded up his breath. It is charged that one of the agents of Clement had given him a poisoned

drink. He was buried in the church of St. Peter on the sixteenth of October, 1389. His death excited no regret, for he had become odious to even those who followed his fortunes. His greed and cruelty render him infamous even in the annals of the popes. According to the chronicles of the times he died accursed of both God and men. He is a fit representative and champion of the Church in those days of darkness when it reigned the despot of the world.

Indeed, the papacy has produced little but monstrosities. Profane history cannot furnish a catalogue of monarchs so blackened with crime. With a triple crown on their heads, with the keys of heaven and hell in their hands, and assuming to be the vicegerents of God on earth, claiming all the authority and holiness of heaven, the bishops of Rome stand before the world clotted with the blood of generations, with their feet on the necks of princes and people, the hierophants of vice and hypocrisy, pride, perjury, and all that is base and ignoble in human nature.

ANTIPOPES,

COUNTER-POPES, AND VACANCIES.

THE great Western Schism of Avignon, which, after the death of Gregory XI., broke out with great fury, and which, for fifty years turned Europe upside down, is more or less known to many of our readers as matter of papal notoriety and non-infallibility. It was, indeed, a wonderful time. From September 21, 1378, to July 26, 1429, in Germany, France, Spain, and Italy princes and people took up arms to defend either the rights of the popes of Rome or to make the counter-popes of Avignon triumph. These infallibles excommunicated and denounced each other, revealing the turpitude of each, and reciprocally accused their rivals of incest and sodomy, giving and retaliating the epithets thieves, assassins, heretics, and antipopes.

This period in the history of the Church is one of those which present the most curious episodes, when we are permitted to go behind the scenes of the pontifical theatre, and observe the machinery which moves the theocratic decorations. All the consecrated actors put off their spiritual masks and exhibited themselves in their terrestrial figures as ambitious, avaricious, vindictive, debauched, and cruel, solely occupied with duping men and changing the holy water into a stream of gold.

History has not yet decided which of them were the true pontiffs; and, as in the course of their reigns they were rivals in crimes and outrages, one cannot say which of them were the most execrable, and best deserved the title of pope. A famous Jesuit, Father Maimberg, says: "We must avow that in the course of thirteen centuries no schism was more

alarming than that, as well from the atrocities which the two parties committed as from the impossibility under which the Church labored for fifty years of recognizing which was the lawful pope. A universal council, which had the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit, could not decide this grave question; and the fathers declared that it was better to act by authority than from a knowledge of facts in a cause so involved; and, in fact, they deposed the two popes and proceeded to the election of a third pontiff. Thus was seen, at this deplorable time, a thing which had never before occurred —they declared that there was a schism without schismatics."

How came this schism about? All the pontiffs up to Clement V. (1335) had resided in Rome. This pope, however, being a Frenchman favorable to Philip and the Ghibelines, as against the Italian party, fixed his residence at Avignon, where his immediate successors also continued to reside for the good reason that they also were Frenchmen, whose love of country probably exceeded their zeal for religion. Their absence from Rome excited rebellion in cities and places which were the ancient patrimony of the Roman Church; and those cities broke the yoke of officers who oppressed them in the name of strange popes. The result was that the apostolic see drew no more revenue from its old domains, and was even obliged to levy troops to bring back its subjects to their duty. All those wars weakened the resources of the Holy City; the want of money reduced the papacy to the lowest degree of contempt and abjectness.

On the death of Gregory XI., in March 1378, a deputation from the chief magistrates of Rome addressed the college of cardinals, urging them to choose a pontiff who was a Roman or an Italian by birth, and would naturally reside at Rome, and help restore its ancient prestige and glory. The cardinals could only protest their good intentions, declaring, however, that they could not enter into any formal engagement. But they were soon terrorized into the nomination of an Italian pontiff, and obliged to consecrate him by the name of Urban VI. They soon tired of his tyranny, however, and

availed themselves of the return of summer to obtain permission to leave Rome and go to Anagni. On the day succeeding their arrival they were joined by the cardinal camerlingo, who brought with him the tiara, the keys of St. Peter, the apostolic ring, and the other pontifical ornaments. They then published a decree, declaring the election of Urban null, as having been produced by violence. The upshot of it all was that the French members of the cardinalate engaged themselves in forming a conclave, and wrote secretly to three Italian cardinals, partizans of Urban, to induce them to come to the conclave, by leading them each to hope that the choice of his colleagues would fall on him. This ruse succeeded perfectly: the three cardinals hastened to take part in the ballot: they were not long in discovering they had been tricked, for on counting the vote, Robert of Geneva was proclaimed chief of the Church, and enthroned by the name of Clement VII.

Now, if Urban was a butcher and an assassin, having, soon after the defection of the French cardinals, mentioned above, ordered his satellites to make a general massacre of the French inhabitants of Rome, without sparing sex or age, several bishops, indeed, having been assassinated in his own chamber, where they had taken refuge to implore his pity; if Urban was all this, we say, his counter-pope—he of Avignon, was a luxurious individual, addicted to unnamable vices, choosing, from preference, his mistresses and minions from his own family, and loading them with riches, honors, and dignities. His public inclinations were those of an unscrupulous emperor, sparing nothing wherewith to treat with royal luxury the dukes, lords, and embassadors who were admitted to his table: and all this with the means wrung from the toil and sweat and blood of industry and poverty. Thus, from the portraits which have been left of these two popes by ecclesiastical historians whose attachment to the holy see cannot be doubted, we cannot say which of these two priests was the most worthy to occupy the apostolic chair.

In France, a synod composed of prelates, doctors, and the

principal lords, declared, as the result of inquiries into allegations against Urban and Clement, that both were unworthy of the tiara, and both had been irregularly chosen. But another synod voted for Clement, who was solemnly recognized as the sovereign pontiff. The example of France drew after it Lorraine, Savoy, Scotland, Navarre, and at length Arragon and Castile, leaving the other Catholic countries to Urban.

A bitter war then commenced between the two popes. Anathemas, interdicts, depositions, and maledictions were the prelude to the bloody strife which was soon to overwhelm the western nations. Urban launched a bull against his competitor, and cited him to appear before the court of Rome to be judged and condemned as antipope; Clement, on his side, fulminated a terrible decree against his enemy, and cited him before his consistory of Avignon to be judged for his usurpation of the apostolical chair. Finally, both having refused to appear, they anathematized each other by bell, candle, and book, declaring each other apostates, schismatics, and heretics; they preached crusades against each other, and called to their aid all the banditti and malefactors of Italy and France, and let them loose like wild beasts on the unfortunate inhabitants who recognized Clement or preferred Urban.

And so matters went on between the Clementists and Urbanists—between the Romanists and Avignonists—for half a blessed century. It was a hellish jubilee of crime of all kinds, and of the blackest moods, in most unholy alliance with an accursed carnival of dissipation and licentiousness.

But this Avignon schism was not by any means the commencement, though it was the systematic culmination of the spectacular drama of "Pope, Counter-Pope, and Antipope."

As far back as the year 252, Novatian appeared as the first anti-bishop of Rome, or antipope, as the Catholic writers would force us to believe, from the unhesitating declaration that all the bishops of Rome, from St. Peter to the present day, were in reality popes. Then in the year 366 Felix II., a creature of the emperor, was ordained pontiff in the presence

of the imperial eunuchs, and in the imperial palace, although, according to Athanasius, it should have happened in the church. But the legitimate pope, Libinus, who had now returned from exile, soon triumphed over his competitor, drove him from the city, and reduced him to the state of a bishop without a church. He subsequently retired, after having been the means of exciting in Rome violent quarrels and bloody combats, to a small estate which he owned, where he lived nearly eight years.

After the death of Felix, popes Damasus and Ursinus had also a fine time of it in rending Church and society and each other for years over their rival claims.

In the course of the sixth century, the city of Rome thrice witnessed the disgraceful spectacle of rival pontiffs, with fierce hatred, bloodshed, and massacre, contending with each other for the spiritual throne. The first of these struggles occurred about the commencement of the century, between Symmachus and Laurentius, who were on the same day elected to the pontificate by different parties, and whose dispute was at length decided by Theodoric, king of the Goths. Each of these ecclesiastics maintained obstinately the validity of his election; they reciprocally accused each other of the most detestable crimes; and, to their mutual dishonor, their accusations did not appear on either side entirely destitute of foundation. Three different councils, assembled at Rome, endeavored to terminate this odious schism, but without success. A fourth was summoned by Theodoric, in 503, to examine the accusations brought against Symmachus, and in it the Roman pontiff was acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge. But the adverse party refused to acquiesce in this decision, and this gave occasion to Ennodius, bishop of Ticinium (now Pavia), to draw up his adulatory apology for the council and Symmachus. It was in this apology that the assertion was first hazarded that "the bishop of Rome was subject to no earthly tribunal."

Not long afterwards an attempt was made to give the principle a historical basis by bringing forward forged acts of

former pontiffs. In subsequent ages it will be seen that the popes not only declared themselves free from all subjection to every earthly tribunal, but boldly maintained that all earthly powers and potentates were subject to them. In this apology for Symmachus, he is called "Judge in the place of God, and Vicegerent of the Most High." This was the first time, so far as is known, that this blasphemous title was given to the bishop of Rome, though some centuries afterward we find it commonly applied to the reigning pope, "so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. ii, 4).

In 498 there were two counter-bishops of Rome—Symmachus and Lawrence. The latter, however, soon subsided, and left the former to rule sole and supreme.

About the year 530 there was another disgraceful contest engendered at Rome by the rival claims of Boniface II. and Dioscorus, though the premature death of the latter soon put a period to this papal war. But still the century did not close without a scene alike disgraceful. A prelate of the name of Vigilius intrigued at court to procure the deposition of the reigning bishop Silverus. The latter was, in consequence, deprived of his dignities and banished. He appealed to the Emperor Justinian, who interfered in his behalf, and encouraged him to return to Rome, with the delusive expectation of regaining his rights: but the artifices of Vigilius prevailed—his antagonist was resigned to his power, and immediately confined by him in the islands of Pontus and Pandatara, where, in penury and affliction, he terminated his wretched existence.

During the last few years of the sixth century, the contest for supremacy between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople raged with greater acrimony than at any preceding period. The bishop of Constantinople not only claimed an unrivaled sovereignty over the Eastern churches, but also maintained that his church was, in point of dignity, no way inferior to that of Rome. The Roman pontiffs beheld with impatience these pretensions, and warmly

asserted the preëminence of their Church and its undoubted superiority over that of Constantinople. Gregory the Great distinguished himself in this violent contest: and the fact that in a council held in 588, John the Faster, bishop of Constantinople, assumed the title of "universal bishop," furnished Gregory with a favorable opportunity of exerting his zeal. Supposing that the design of his rival was to obtain the supremacy over all Christian churches, Gregory opposed his pretensions with the utmost vehemence, and, in order to establish more firmly his own authority, invented the fiction of the power of the keys, as committed to the successor of St. Peter rather than to the body of bishops. In his letter to the Emperor Mauritius on the pretensions of the Constantinopolitan hierarch to the title of universal bishop, he says: "Whoever adopts or affects the title of Universal Bishop—his blasphemous title—has the pride and character of Antichrist, . . . as pride makes Antichrist strain his pretensions, up to Godhead; and in his opposition to it, hypocritically adopts as his title "Servant of the servants of God." Let the reader ponder well this extract from the epistle of Gregory, confessedly one of the most eminent of the Roman bishops, and who has by them been canonized as saint, and then judge whether we are not justified in pronouncing the era of the papal supremacy, when only two years after Gregory's death, Pope Boniface III. sought for and obtained the title of universal bishop, as the date of the full revelation of Antichrist. In this we but repeat the opinion so emphatically expressed by St. Gregory only a few years before the actual occurrence of this remarkable event in the history of popery. Boniface, who succeeded to the Roman see in 605, was so far from having any scruples about adopting this blasphemous title that he actually applied for and obtains it in 606 from Phocas, a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant, who strictly forbade the bishop of Constantinople (against whom he had a grudge) to use it. This Phocas also declared the Church of Rome to be head over all other churches. So the title of universal bishop which was then

obtained by Boniface, made him, properly speaking, the first of the popes; and this title has been worn by all succeeding popes, and the claim of supremacy, which was then established, has ever since been maintained and defended by them up to the present day.

In 680 Pope Honorius—the very universal bishop himself—was solemnly condemned as a heretic by the sixth general council. This is a complete refutation of the claim so frequently urged by the Jesuits and other advocates of Rome of the infallibility of the pope. Till it is proved that two contraries can be exactly alike, this boasted claim of infallibility must be abandoned. How absurd, in the face of all this, is the favorite and much-quoted dictum of Louis Capensis, "We can believe nothing if we do not believe, with a divine faith, that the pope is infallible;" and how immoral and devilish the famous saying of the great Cardinal Bellarmine, "If the pope should err by enjoining vices or prohibiting virtues, the Church, unless she would sin against conscience, would be bound to believe vices to be good and virtues evil."

Space will not allow more than a mere mention of the names and dates of the antipopes subsequent to Honorius. They are as follows: Zinzinus, in 824; Sergius, in 891; John XVI., in 997; Sylvester III., in 1004; John XX., in 1045; Honorius II., in 1061; Gregory VIII., in 1118; Anaclet II., in 1139; Victor IV., in 1159; Nicholas V., in 1328, exactly fifty years before the great schism of Avignon; and Eugenius, in 1439, ten years after that schism.

And not only had there been many antipopes before the beginning of this great and most unseemly rent in the holy garments of the blessed Mother Church, but several criminal reinstallations of various ambitious ex-popes, who had been exiled on account of their unbearable tyranny and cruelty and horrible vices had also taken place, to wit: John XII., fitly named The Monster, reinstated by revolt in the year 964; Leo VIII., reinstalled by the emperor in the same year; our delectable old acquaintance, Boniface VII., set on his throne again by a parricide, in 985, Gregory V., re-poped (in

place of the antipope, John XVI) in 997; and Benedict IX., the magnificent perjurer, adulterer, incestuose, and pederast, who remounted the holy see for the fourth time in 1047.

And not only were there for fifty years counter-popes at Avignon to those who were afterwards, by courtesy, called popes of Rome, but, as we may see by the following list, the phenomenon of a *tertius quis* also occasionally arose in the form of a third pontiff, a contemporary antipope to both the Roman and Avignon hierarchs:

LIST OF VICARS OF CHRIST FROM 1378 TO 1429.

Year 1378	Urban VI., at Rome. Clement VII., at Avignon.
Year 1389	Boniface IX., at Rome. Clement VII. and Benedict XII., at Avignon.
Year 1404	Innocent VII., at Rome. Benedict XIII., at Avignon.
Year 1406	Gregory XII., at Rome. Benedict XIII., at Avignon.
Year 1409	Alexander V., at Rome. Benedict XIII., at Avignon. Gregory XII., antipope.
Year 1410	John XXIII., at Rome. Benedict XIII., at Avignon. Gregory XII., antipope.
Year 1416	Martin V., at Rome. Benedict XIII., antipope. Clement VII., antipope.

We have still another tell-tale statement to make. Not only have there been antipopes, counter-popes, and re-popes, but several vacancies and interregums in the holy see have occurred from time to time. If space allowed, it could be abundantly shown, to the utter historical and logical conviction of the reader, that there were sundry periods of time, long or short, when Christ had actually no vicegerent on

earth, and when, consequently, millions of precious souls must, merely on account of those very fallible faults of infallibility, and perhaps for no fault of their own, have been forever lost. But we have only room for the following tabular exhibit:

TABLE OF VACANCIES IN THE HOLY SEE.

Year	250 – 2.	Vacancy of a year and a half.
"	258.	" " one year.
"	301 – 4.	" " three years.
"	708.	" " three months.
"	731.	" " thirty-five days.
"	985.	John, the son of Robert, was chosen pontiff, and merely occupied the holy see for four months, having died towards the end of this year, before being consecrated. It is on this account that the Church does not reckon him in the number of popes.
"	1054 – 5.	Vacancy of one year.
"	1269–71.	" " nearly three years.
"	1293.	" " twenty-seven months.
"	1294.	" " ten days.
"	1314 – 6.	" " two years.

What a commentary on the vaunted unbroken unity of the Catholic (universal) Church! And what an array of its own champions to bring about these terrible schisms and vacancies!

URSULA.

VIRGIN, MARTYR, SAINT.

[THE FOLLOWING IS FROM THE PEN OF PROF. A. L. RAWSON, D.D., L.L.D.]

IN THE beginning of its career as an institution, the Christian Church naturally depended on its pagan parents for its earliest examples of heroes, martyrs, and sacred personages. Some ages must have elapsed, and many conditions must have favored its enrichment in traditional lore, before a new Church could have created ideals of its own and located them in its calendar. Such was the case in the history of the Church. Its mental dependence on paganism continued long after it had assumed a new name and a new ritual and had ungratefully repudiated its debt as to its pagan origin.

In no other region has the Church so clearly shown, even to the present day, its continued dependence on its pagan progenitors as in that of its catalogue of saints. All its chief characters are of pagan origin, with a trifling change of name in baptism. In this respect St. Ursula is no exception. The Biographical Dictionary says of her that she was "a legendary personage, of whom scarcely anything is positively known. She is said to have been the daughter of a prince of Brittany, and to have suffered martyrdom at Cologne in the fourth or fifth century."

We are informed by Church history that the order of the Ursuline Nuns was first organized by St. Angela of Brescia, A. D. 1537, and dedicated to St. Ursula. The name was canonized at that time, of course, and even much earlier, as we shall see later on in this notice.

The employment of the Ursuline nuns consist in teaching young ladies in their convents. In that business nuns, if well trained themselves, and apt to teach, may be as useful as

the average school teachers, but their isolation and vows of seclusion and privacy unfits them as teachers of young women who are to take an active part in the world.

A few years since I found leisure to look about among the religious houses of the famous city of Cologne on the Rhine. Among others, one of the most attractive, as to its outside and inside appearance and belongings, was the church of St. Osla. That is what my kind and obliging guide said was its local name. The church edifice belongs to some past age; and its strange decorations of skulls and cross-bones, grinning and posturing, as they do, from every wall and corner of the dingy and dusty old place, belong to the past also. There are bones everywhere; bones built into the walls, or fastened to their faces, in rosettes, festoons, stars, crosses, and every other form possible for bones to be arranged in. The fragments were hid in the niches behind the skulls, or shaped by inclosing stones and mortar into long boxes, or sarcophagi, in various places about the floor of the church, where they serve as seats, and there are no other seats there. No one goes there for a comfortable time. It is a place for penitents, who must kneel on the solid and cold stone.

In a corner room attached to the main body of the church there is what is called "the gold room." There is a great display of gold in that hideous apartment. On every side there are shelves full of grinning skulls, and, standing on tables nearly covering the floor, there are many cabinets of fine woods, bound with brass, silver, or gold, and very highly ornamented, so far as elaborate design goes. In these cabinets there are skulls and other bones, ornamented according to their various degrees of honor and distinction. One is silvered all over, another is gilded, another both silvered and gilded; and, added to these, are precious stones and pearls in great profusion, the gifts of princes and wealthy people who have enriched the place by their presents.

But we must not delay the account of the saint and her eleven thousand companions while occupied in describing even this ancient pile of stone and plaster and decorations. With-

out elaborately detailed engravings it would be impossible to do more than give a very general impression of the quaint old edifice. That work belongs to the tourist; our task is with the equally quaint and ancient legend of St. Ursula and her eleven thousand virgin companions—virgins and martyrs, every one.

It would be next to impossible, at this late day in the history of the world and of the Church, to determine the exact age in which this curious legend first arose into a distinct and tangible shape. We can find when it was first noticed by a writer of Church legends, or chronicles; but even in that case there is a want of detail and careful statement as to persons, places, and time that leaves the matter in a very vague condition.

Some of the early writers said that in the age when Christianity and paganism were contending with each other for the mastery over the people, a noble maid and several of her companions were put to death for having avowed their faith in the new religion of Christ. The date of this event is variously stated by different writers. Some say in A. D. 237, or 383, or perhaps 451. It is again said that this vague tradition can be traced as far back as the year A. D. 600, but there are very few, if any, reliable proofs of its mention before A.D. 846, when the legend was included in the German martyrology of Wandelbert. Then the number of virgins was given as XI. M.V., which may be interpreted as eleven martyr virgins, or as eleven thousand virgins. When the good and pious monks found it in their hearts to do a substantial service in writing up this legend for the benefit of the Church, and as an example of youth and beauty, the larger number was adopted as the true one, as we find in the writings of Bishop Herman of Cologne, A. D. 922.

Some critical writers have suggested that the true story is that St. Ursula and one virgin named Undecimilla were beheaded for the faith, and that the large number of eleven thousand (undecimilla is Latin for 11,000) is only a translation into numbers of the name of this one girl.

The story itself has grown to very different proportions in various countries, and the comparison of the several versions would afford entertainment to the student, but we can only glance at them in this connection.

Here is the legend in its most popular form: A certain famous king of the olden time reigned over his happy subjects in Brittany (or Britain, or anywhere else the reader's fancy may suggest), assisted by the love and council of his gifted and beautiful queen, Daria, who was a Sicilian by birth. Both were Christians, and they were very much respected and loved by their people, but they had only one child, a daughter, whom they named, at her baptism in infancy, Ursula (which means "little bear." An affectionate bit of fun, probably).

The mother died while Ursula was yet but a child of ten or twelve years, and the unhappy king found in his daughter's society his only consolation, for she supplied her mother's place at court.

Now, this daughter was wonderfully beautiful, and gifted with all the external graces of the most favored of her sex, and, withal, deeply learned in the scholastic lore of the age, for her instructors were the wisest and best of the land. Her mind became a storehouse of every excellent thing of wisdom and knowledge that had been extant in the world since the days of Adam and Eve. The poets and philosophers of Greece, Egypt, India, and other nations, were mere pastimes to her, for she was familiar with all their writings. Her knowledge of theology was so profound that she astonished and confounded the doctors of theology by her logic and eloquence.

There was no one in that age that was more highly esteemed for humility, piety, and charity. All who knew her, and those who had only heard her praises repeated, said she was the most charming, gifted, and accomplished princess of the period.

Her father naturally loved his daughter, and was made happy when she announced her determination to remain

single all her life, having refused the offer of marriage from several princes of different nations who had been attracted by her great fame, which filled the whole civilized world.

Among the suitors was Conon, the son of the king of England. We search in vain among the histories of England for any name corresponding to Prince Conon or his father, King Agrippinus, or among those of Brittany for the King Theonotus, or, as the Italian versions give it, "Il Re Mauro," which is to write 'the King Mauro.' And here it may be well to make a note of a reflection on religious legends generally with a word of caution to their inventors. Since the spiritual truth is always far more important than any vulgar facts could possibly be, the legends should always be written independent of time, place, or persons, beginning, as the German nursery tales do, with the familiar phrase, "Once upon a time there was a famous king" (prince, virgin, martyr, or whatever the subject happens to be). The mind of the reader would then be led gently from one emotion to another up to the climax when martyrdom would seem to be as easy and natural as going to sleep under ordinary circumstances. This is the style of many of the legends of the Church, and, as you will presently notice, is the character of some portions of this most fanciful tale.

As usual in such cases, the legend favors the reader with a minute detail of the manly qualities of the young prince in contrast with the womanly graces of the virgin, and the remarkable fitness of each to each as husband and wife seems to be next door to miraculous. Every one is on tip-toe in expectation of the wedding presents of its favorites. The English king with the Roman-Hebrew name sends embassadors to the French king with an Italian name, and the pious and Christian daughter gladdens her father's heart by announcing the coldness of her own and her determination to remain in single blessedness all her life, having dedicated herself to Christ.

Now, the father had political expediency at heart more than his domestic peace, so he practiced the diplomatic art of

entertaining the embassadors just to gain time, and give himself a chance to devise a way out of the difficulty.

The gifted daughter suggested the means of pacifying the embassadors, answering the king's request for his son, and of continuing her vow of perpetual chastity all in one, which she announced in a neat little speech from beside her father's throne.

We quote: "Having received and returned the salutation of the embassadors with unspeakable grace and dignity, she thus spoke: 'I thank my lord, the king of England, and Conon his princely son, his noble barons, and you, sirs, his honorable embassadors, for the honor you have done me, so much greater than my deserving. I hold myself bound to your king as to a second father, and to the prince, his son, as to my brother and bridegroom, for to no other will I ever listen. But I have to ask three things. First, he shall give me as ladies and companions ten virgins of the noblest blood in his kingdom, and to each of these a thousand attendants, and to me also a thousand maidens to wait on me. Secondly, he shall permit me for three years to honor my virginity, and with my companions to visit the holy shrine where repose the bodies of the saints. And the third is, that the prince and his court shall receive Christian baptism; for other than a Christian I cannot wed.'"

We are compelled to admire the subtlety of this Christian maid, and the skill with which she lays crafty plans to deceive. It is said in the legend that she hoped to escape through the hardness of the terms, or if not, to secure the salvation of the prince and eleven thousand virgins, by dedicating them to the service of God. Just how they were to serve God by remaining virgins has not been explained, and that is probably one of the profound mysteries that are never to be fully explained in this sinful world.

The legend proceeds in due and ancient form, but we must abridge by giving only a few details where the original gives volumes. The English king and his son were delighted, and at once gathered eleven thousand virgins and assembled them

in Brittany, in the capital of King Theonotus, thereby adding to the joy and thankfulness of Ursula's heart that so many of her sex had been rescued from the vanities of the wicked world.

The fame of this unusual gathering of virgins was a great incentive to barons, knights, esquires, and other gentry from east to west, who came out of mere curiosity, just to look on this beautiful assemblage—just to gaze and nothing more. The legend adds: "And you may think how much they were amazed and edified by the sight of so much beauty and so much devotion."

The first service Ursula rendered the assembled maidens was to preach to them, which she did with so great unction that "all those virgins, moved by a holy zeal, wept, and, lifting up their hands and their voices, promised to follow her whithersoever she should lead." And multitudes of them confessed and were baptized then and there in a clear stream that flowed through the bright green meadow studded with flowers where they were gathered.

Being summoned by Ursula, Prince Conon hastened to her side, when she related to him a vision that she had, in which "it was revealed to her that she must travel." (Such visions afflict maidens in our day, and they marry and go away to Saratoga, Europe, or the country.)

The vision instructed them that the maid and her attendants were to visit the holy city, Rome, and its shrines, and the prince was to remain with her father to assist him in his government. If she died away on her pilgrimage the prince was to succeed her in her father's kingdom.

Some versions say the prince attended her on the pilgrimage, while others give him the less manly duty of staying behind.

The virgins were miraculously taught to sail and manage the ships, and away they went, up north, to the Rhine and the city of Cologne. There the holy virgin received another revelation in a vision to the effect that they were to visit Rome as designed, and return to Cologne, where they were to

suffer martyrdom to a maid, every one, for the cause of God, when the legend says, "they all together lifted up their voices in hymns of thanksgiving that they should be found worthy so to die."

Six angels shoveled snow before them in crossing the high Alps, and bridged the deep streams, and pitched tents for them every night.

Having arrived near Rome, the good bishop of that see, Cyriacus (probably the writer intended Bishop Siricius, called pope, who is dated A. D. 384), attended by all his clergy, went out to meet the host of virgins. They might well have been astonished and amazed at the sight of that brilliant throng, for they had been professing all their lives to worship a dead virgin, what should they do in the presence of eleven thousand live ones? The bishop settled that. He ordered that "to preserve their maidenly honor and decorum, tents were to be pitched (the six angels had wearied of the tent business), outside of the walls of the city, on the plains toward Tivoli."

There is a clashing among the differing versions of the legend which is annoying to the student to whom simple truth is precious. While in one version, as we have just read, Prince Conon remains with King Agrippinus, in another he travels with his adored Ursula. So we have in the one an account of his journey to Rome by another route and arrival there on the same day as his affianced and her company.

Together Conon and Ursula kneel at the feet of Pope Cyriacus (Siricius?) and receive baptism and blessings. Conon's name was changed to Ethereus in token of the regeneration and purity of his soul. His soul being thus purified, it thereafter longed not for earthly bliss in union with his idol love, Ursula, but for spiritual and heavenly bliss to be earned by the crown of martyrdom.

The maids set out on their return towards Cologne, and, as was natural, Pope Cyriacus attended them. It will be noticed that the highest honors ever waited on our heroine. Thus it ever is, in the legends of the holy Church, in reward for

faithfulness and perseverance, if not in this world, there is sure to be a crown "already laid up for them in heaven."

Two great Roman captains commanded all the troops in Germany at that time, and they happened to be in Rome when Ursula & Co. were there. They said, "If we permit these maids to return through Germany singing and praying, they will convert the whole nation; or if they marry Germans, their children will all be Christians and so overturn our ancient religion." They, therefore, conspired with a barbarian king of the Huns (whose name is unfortunately lost to the calendar of saints), who was then besieging the city of Cologne.

The pope, some cardinals, archbishops, bishops, patriarchs, and other prelates, besides many others, attended the eleven thousand virgins, who observed the strictest propriety in conduct at all times.

We are to presume that the good offices of the angelic six cleared the way over the Alps as before, for the host arrived safely on the banks of the Rhine and embarked. Boats of all kinds were somewhat in demand, and were probably furnished by the aforesaid "six."

The flotilla arrived at Cologne; the barbarians attacked it. Ethereus was the first to fall at the feet of his adored Ursula, pierced by an arrow, then the pope, cardinals, and so on in regular order according to rank, were slain, or rather crowned with martyrdom in exact rotation, until all the men were extinct. Then the barbarians "rushed upon the virgins just as a pack of gaunt, hungry wolves might fall on a flock of milk-white lambs." The order of slaying the maids was reversed, and the humblest was "crowned" first, and so on in an ascending scale until Ursula stood last of all, when she was offered life as the queen of the barbarian king. As might have been expected, she refused to be separated from her companions, and the enraged king "crowned" the maiden by shooting three arrows, which "transfixed her pure breast." Their ascent to heaven, their reception there, their occupation in wearing crowns and waving palms around the throne, are

minutely detailed in the several legends, which agree more nearly in matters relating to the invisible than in those of the visible world, as is usual in Church papers.

The artist has been called on frequently to portray the life and works of St. Ursula, and the pictures and statues of her and her companions are to be seen in every corner of Europe, the most notable being those at Cologne, Milan, Paris, Augsburg, and in London, both at Kensington and at the British Museum. In all of these the glory of the Church, the reward of fidelity to the Church, the exceeding great rewards given to the faithful to the Church, are set forth in the most gorgeous colors and attractive forms. This is the lesson and the only lesson the Church has in its keeping of this legend.

To the looker-on there is another side to the sign-board, painted in other colors. Instead of St. Ursula and her eleven thousand companions the critical student sees in an allegory the moon and the stars on their nightly course. To the uneducated eleven thousand is as expressive of the countless number as any other. The name was derived from the local name for the moon, which sounds very like Ursula. The poetical and fanciful embellishments of the original idea are the result of several centuries of growth, by one writer adding to or improving upon the work of another.

The location of the legend at Cologne is accounted for in a very plain and matter-of-fact manner by the historian of the city, who relates that in clearing away portions of the ruined walls of the city, and some houses built against them, there were found the remains of an ancient cemetery. The ground was needed for the site of a new church, and the bones must be disposed of. The aid of the bishop and the services of a vision-seeing sister were called in, when a revelation was vouchsafed (of course from above), which informed the good people of Cologne of the legend of St. Ursula and the eleven thousand virgins, whose bones had been buried in the cemetery.

Among the bones were some of large size that were pronounced to be those of men, some old, others young. A

scandal arose that the virgins were no better than they should have been, which was perplexing until the good sister had another vision with its convenient revelation, in the style of Mohammed, where light was wanted on a given point in controversy. The husband and other attendants of the virgin were admitted as relatives and friends of the virgins to have accompanied them as guards on the journey to and from Rome.

There were other bones that were still more vexing to the bishop, for they were said to be of little children of various ages from a week old upwards. Then scandal spoke again and said the virgins could not have been as good as they ought to have been. And yet again the good sister had a vision in which it was revealed that the children belonged to the families of the friends and relatives who had accompanied the virgins.

We might venture the remark that (like lies) when one revelation has been invented it requires the invention of a great number to sustain the first.

The assumption that the bones of the ancient cemetery of Cologne, probably the Roman colony, were those of a saint and her attendants required many explanations to fit the case for popular use. The origin of the bones has passed into the dim long ago, and is seldom mentioned, while the allegorical and poetical legend of St. Ursula remains fresh on the lips of the priest and his assistants at the old church in Cologne, where the bones with their quaint arrangement around the walls, and gilded decorations in the chapel, are as attractive as the nature of the dead and repulsive material can be made to appear. We wonder how long those bones will yet bear up against the ravages of time, and how long the legend will remain in favor with cultured men. For the uneducated crowd fresh bones can be added from time to time as the old ones crumble into shapeless dust. Can the legend be explained by new revelations from time to time as the critics take away one part from another? One of the latest commentaries on the legend says it represents the voyage of life with all its vicissitudes, presented in a religious allegory

which would be well enough if this were not a very practical and exacting age, an age in which hard facts are demanded, in which every one may draw their own conclusions.

In spite of the most scathing strokes of the critic's pen this beautiful legend has kept its hold on the popular fancy, and remains the especial delight of the women, whom it elevates into a grand and poetical position, for the moment superior to the sterner sex. The millennium of joy and peace may not be very far off; until then this legend and many others which are the peculiar property of the Church will be too precious to be suffered to pass into oblivion. Thus the Church ever trades on the dearest instincts of the human family. The Church itself must be enlightened when it will permit (it can never lead) the enlightenment of the people. Until it is elevated it must of necessity use the means of enslaving and degrading mankind.

The beautiful mythology of the ancient Greeks was the deification of the aspects, powers, and harmonies of nature; the theology of the new faith, that will before long displace the Christian idea, will be shaped by the aspirations and affections of humanity. The more violent emotions and passions now shape the faith of the Church. Every passion, appetite, or emotion is idealized into an extreme, personified and dramatized in some legend of the life of St. so-and-so, and generally martyr in the bargain. Church art has been busy in sacred edifices all over Christendom in grouping in churches, chapels, convents, schools, and hospitals, sacred personages, among whom the saint is always to be found. Each of these saints represent some good power or some attribute of Christ, the divine and the universal ideal. In so far as they incite emulation in the hearts of the worshipers good may follow, but the living, present, human being should move the truly pious soul to action more than the lifeless image of an ideal impossibility. Let all true men and women, for the sake of common sense, lay aside among the tales for amusing children all such legends as this of "St. Ursula" let all truly pious souls find an example in the real men and women who have

lived and worked for their kind, rather than in an ideal poetic dream which may please the fancy but does not move the soul to healthy action. The real saints of this world do not seek a crown of martyrdom, nor do they live in caves or convents or monasteries. They are here and there among living, acting humanity, quietly doing their work of elevating themselves and their associates into a higher and better life, lending a helping hand or giving a kind word as there is need by the way.

JOHN XXIII.

AND THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

Balthasar Cossa, the subject of this sketch, was born of a noble Neapolitan family. Even in his earliest infancy he evinced a martial disposition. Notwithstanding this, his parents, when he arrived at the proper age, obliged him to enter a monastery. His stay there was short. Escaping from the convent, he joined a band of pirates, who ravaged the shores of lower Italy during the wars between Louis of Anjou and Ladislaus. At length he became a commander of these corsairs.

Entirely destitute of conscience, shame, and remorse: ignoring all laws, human and divine; actuated by a natural cruelty which prompted him to the perpetration of the most frightful atrocities; he possessed in the highest degree those qualities which in time of war make great captains and in time of peace great villains.

Upon the restoration of peace to the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, he was compelled to give up his calling as a corsair. He then made up his mind to become a priest. He went to the university of Bologna, where he bought a doctor's cap. Pope Boniface IX. sold him the archdeaconate of that city. Becoming tired of Bologna, he removed to Rome. He was soon raised to the rank of cardinal and the post of secret chamberlain, as a reward of his infamous compliance with the desires of Boniface. He profited by his new position to make up the large losses he had squandered in the brothels of Bologna.

Having secured the appointment of collector-general of the Church, he sent his agents through all Europe, and levied

contributions on the ecclesiastics of Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Under the threat of removing them into provinces remote from their churches, he constrained them to buy from him indulgences, benefices, relics, and absolutions.

By his resort to sacerdotal knavery, he found himself, in less than two years, far richer than the pope, and able to purchase immunity for his crimes. These he did not hesitate to commit; for they related at Rome how he used to steal into the cells of young nuns, and how he carried on an incestuous intercourse with the wife of his brother. His debaucheries at length became so shameless that Pope Boniface himself, wretch as he was, was compelled to send him away from his court.

The people of Bologna had revolted against the papal authority. The Cardinal Cossa was placed at the head of the pontifical troops, and succeeded in seizing the city. He now became an absolute master, and gave free course to his unbridled passions. There was soon not a youth or young girl, no matter what their rank, or the nobility of their family, who were beyond the reach of this infamous priest. Fathers and mothers, who dared dispute for their children with the purveyors of the cardinal, were plunged into the dungeons of the Inquisition. It is related that this monster violated children in the presence of their parents, and even while they were writhing beneath the hot pincers of the executioners.

Upon the death of Boniface the citizens of Bologna hoped to be delivered from their tyrant, and sent enormous sums to Innocent VII., the new pope, to recall the cardinal. But Balthasar forestalled their negotiation by sending to the holy Father double the amount forwarded by the Bolognese. He then turned over to the tribunal of the Inquisition all those suspected of having engaged in the above undertaking. The pontificate of Innocent passed without bringing relief to the unhappy Bolognese. Gregory XII. succeeded, and again the citizens made an effort to remove the cruel cardinal. Gregory revoked his appointment, and issued an anathema against

him. But Balthasar had formed a powerful party among the people for himself by the distribution of grain and money. He secured the alliance of Louis III., duke of Anjou, by pledging him his aid in the conquest of Naples. He refused to longer submit to the orders of Rome; and, having bribed the other cardinals, he determined to call a council and choose a new pope.

This conclave was convened on the fourteenth of May, 1410. Cossa came to it in the costume of a corsair, clad in a coat of mail, with a sword by his side; and taking his place among the cardinals, threatened them if they presumed to appoint a pope without his approval. This abominable assassin chilled the conclave with fear. The cardinal of Malta was proposed as a candidate for the pontificate. "No; I reject him," thundered Balthasar to the trembling members of the council. They then besought him to name whom he would have appointed. "Well, then I give myself the pontifical mantle," he replied to them; "and I will with it cover the only cardinal who is worthy to wear it." He put it on at once, and stretching out his arm toward the tiara, exclaimed, "I am pope." He then proceeded to the cathedral, and, after submitting to the ceremony of the pierced chair, was consecrated by the name of John XXIII.

In order to prepare his way to the papal chair he had put Pope Alexander V. out of the way by poison. Having prevailed on the pontiff to visit him at Bologna, he had his physician, Daniel of St. Sophia, on the evening of the third of May, 1410, administer to him a poisoned clyster, of which he died during the night. Out of gratitude for this service, the holy Father, on the day succeeding his election, caused Daniel to be poisoned with wine of Cyprus.

He then sent his hirelings to Rome. They broke the statues of Gregory, tore down his portraits in the churches, and replaced the arms of that pope with those of his own. Intimidated by these demonstrations, the senators sent a deputation to John to beseech him to come and take possession of the Vatican. At first the wary pontiff seemed to turn

a deaf ear to their solicitations; but in a few days he entered Rome with his cardinals, and followed by a formidable army. He celebrated the event on the eve of the day of his arrival by a magnificent feast, at which was displayed all the luxuriousness of the Neroes and Caligulas; and to complete the resemblance to those tyrants, he spent the next day in bloody executions of those whom he suspected of favoring his competitor Gregory.

And now succeeded a series of military struggles with the powers of Europe for the maintenance of his pontifical sovereignty, which it will not be possible to follow in this sketch. He obtained recognition as lawful pope from France, England, and Germany. He governed Rome as an absolute despot, bearing down the citizens by his exactions, and sparing neither his cardinals nor the officers of his court. One historian relates that he invited his friends to festivals, in order to make an appeal to their purses under the name of the collection for the communion. This author says: "He spread before his guests generous wines, and when intoxication came on, he called in his chamberlain, who presented empty urns in which each placed his offering. Those who declined assisting at the orgies of Balthasar Cossa none the less excited his cupidity. The officers of the apostolic chamber came on the next day to present to them quittances for sums borrowed from the holy Father; those who said they owed nothing were immediately arrested, conducted to the dungeons of the Vatican, and tortured by the inquisitors, who forced them, according to the quaint expression of John, 'to untie their purses.'" He also levied imposts on wine, grain, and salt, and even the work of artisans. He altered the money, and entirely ruined the commerce of lower Italy. All the wealth which he wrested from the people was divided among his concubines and minions. He spent immense sums in constructing a passage between the walls of St. Peter's, by which to secretly introduce into his palace the victims of his tyranny or debauchery.

His infamous career at length caused him to be execrated

by the Romans. Ladislaus, king of Sicily and Naples, resolved to profit by the feeling against him, and seize the holy city. Conspiracies were organized, and companies of soldiers raised among the people. Ladislaus appeared at Rome, and a frightful massacre ensued. Priests, bishops, and monks were mercilessly slaughtered, nuns were violated, churches pillaged, and the rage of the maddened combatants only ceased when there was nothing more to destroy. John fled at the commencement of the storm. The pontifical palace was pillaged; and the sacred ornaments of the chapel, the jewels and relics of saints were, carried away. The stormers transformed the church of St. Peter into a barrack, fed their horses on the altar of the apostle, and converted the chapels of this magnificent church into places of debauchery. The arms and statues of John were broken, his banners torn down, and after fifteen days of obstinate strife, Ladislaus drove out all the partisans of the pope, and remained the absolute master of Rome. The people were oppressed by the tyrant as they had been by the pope; "So much," says an ancient author, "that it really appeared that popes and kings took pleasure in showing to the people that their institution is nothing less than divine, and that it would be better to slay them all."

John was tracked like a wild beast by the troops of Ladislaus. He was driven successively from Sutri, Viterbo, Monte Fiascone, and Sienna. He sent cardinal Chalant with the celebrated Greek monk Chrysoloras to treat with Sigismund, emperor of Germany. The time had come for holding another general council, in which it was supposed lay the only cure for the turbulent state of affairs. The negotiation resulted in a call for a council by the emperor. Constance was chosen as the city for the meeting. John made every effort to change the determination of the emperor to convene the council at Constance. This was a city in the duchy of Suabia; and the pope trembled at the thought of holding a council in a foreign country, in attending which he would be in the power of a prince who had hitherto been his enemy.

He even went to Lodi to see Sigismund and employed all his eloquence to change his determination. But in vain; he was obliged to submit, though secretly cursing the obstinate emperor.

John returned to Bologna to await the session of the council. Ladislaus hastened thither with his troops. A panic seized the cardinals, and they deserted the pontiff to the last man. John waited alone for his enemy—waited for him unalarmed, for he had taken measures to have him poisoned by one of his mistresses. Monstrelet, a contemporary chronicler, thus relates the death of Ladislaus: "This prince could not live many years, because he was too much abandoned to debauchery, and because he had created too much hatred by his cruelty; thus he died, poisoned in an infamous manner. One of his mistresses, the daughter of a physician, bribed by John XXIII., became the instrument of the vengeance of the pope."

His old enemy, the king of Naples, now being out of the way, John left Bologna, and went to the Council of Constance. He still dreaded the consequences of a council in a foreign city, but he took precautions to have it dissolved, under some pretext, should the members manifest any disposition to depose him. A writer who accompanied him in his journey relates the following incident: "Whilst we were on the mountain of Arlberg, in the Tyrol, the pope fell from his horse, and we hastened to raise him up, asking him if he were wounded. 'Not by all the devils,' he exclaimed; 'but this fall is a sinister presage, and indicates to me that I had better have remained at Bologna;' and, looking at the city of Constance in the valley, he added, 'I really believe that is the ditch in which they trap foxes.'"

At length, on the eighteenth of October, 1414, he entered the city, and found assembled there the embassadors of all the kings of Europe, lords, bishops, princes, and legates. The little city shone with the splendor of royal retinues, with the red robes of cardinals, and the ermine and jewels of ecclesiastical princes. The hitherto quiet streets were soon filled with

riot and license, for the Council of Constance is celebrated in history for the corrupt morals of its members and their shameless conduct. Its sittings began in November, 1414. According to the details which have been preserved in the manuscripts of Breslau, the assembly numbered four patriarchs, twenty-eight cardinals, thirty metropolitans, two hundred and six bishops, three hundred titulary bishops, two hundred and three abbots, eighteen auditors of the sacred palace, four hundred and forty doctors, twenty-seven prothonotaries, two hundred and forty writers of bulls, one hundred and twenty-three procurators of the pope, a crowd of attendants of various kinds, twenty-seven embassadors of kings, dukes, or counts, and finally, a great number of deputies from bishops, cities, and universities. This council was the most splendid gathering of priests and princes Europe had ever seen. The Emperor Sigismund attended its sittings, with all the German chiefs and prelates.

At this time three rival popes were contesting each other's claim to the papal chair, viz., John XXIII., Benedict XIII., and Gregory XII. It was evident to all Christendom that there could not be three infallible vicegerents of God upon the same throne. As each pretender asserted his claim with equal vigor, the Council of Constance was called to settle the vexed question which was the true apostolic head of the Church, and to heal the great Western schism.

The Emperor Sigismund, in his opening discourse, informed the members of the council that they had been convened to restore peace to the Church by putting an end to the schism. He appointed a meeting, at which John and his competitors were to be refused admission, in order that there should be no constraint on the proceedings. The wary John feigned compliance, hoping, by his skill at corruption, to win the majority of the members to his side. By the judicious use of threats, promises, and presents, he succeeded. He had thus become master of the council, and all was going well with him, when the emperor became aware of what was occurring. He decided that the votes should be received by

nations, and not by individuals: then, without leaving John longer time to form new intrigues, he put the vote on the proposition that the holy see was vacant. This was carried.

At this sitting the following form of cession was presented to John to execute: "I, John XXIII., declare, pledge myself, and swear to God and this sacred council, to give freely, and of my own free will, peace to the Church, by my pure and simple withdrawal from the pontificate, which I promise to execute as soon as Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. shall have renounced their pretended rights, or shall have died." The holy Father was finally persuaded to read it aloud to the council; when he arrived at the words, "I swear," he went down on his knees, and laying his hand on a crucifix, swore to faithfully observe the conditions thereby imposed on him. The emperor raised him up, and then ordered the council to proceed to the election of a new pope. Upon this unexpected proposal John became furious with rage. He bounded from his seat, and swore he would quit Constance if the emperor persisted in his proposed plans. Sigismund ordered guards placed at all the gates of the city, and signified to the pope that he must subscribe his abdication at once, and without any restriction. John vehemently refused to obey, and proceeded to call the emperor a fool, drunkard, scoundrel, beggar, and barbarian, and threatened him with his most terrific ecclesiastical thunders. Sigismund caused the irate pope to be conducted to his palace and closely guarded. One night when there was a grand fête, John got the guard drunk, disguised himself as a groom, and sallied forth on an old sorry horse, covered with a stout linen cassock, and having a cross-bow suspended to his saddle. He safely reached the city of Shaffhausen, where the duke of Austria, who had aided his flight, came to meet him.

The emperor made preparations to attack the duke of Austria. John retired for safety to the impregnable fortress of Freiburg. The council dispatched deputies to him in hopes of making some arrangements. They found the successor of St. Peter in bed in a most indecent position. After interrupt-

ing the harangue of the pious prelates with various obscene remarks, John made them this reply: "No, I will not place myself within the jaws of the wolf; return to that accursed council, an impure mixture of kings, cobblers, and courtesans; say to them who sent you that I excommunicate them, and will never grant them truce nor repose."

The deputies returned, and the council at once proceeded to the deposition of John. John Gerson, the chancellor of Paris, was appointed prosecutor. Charges of the most atrocious nature were preferred against him, all sustained by irrefutable proof. It was formally and officially declared that Pope John XXIII. had reached the pontificate by causing his predecessor to be poisoned by his physician, Daniel of St. Sophia; that he had poisoned the latter with wine of Cyprus; that he had violated three hundred young nuns of different convents; that he had carried on incestuous relations with the wife of his brother; that he was addicted to the unnatural crime; that he had violated a whole family, consisting of the mother, son, and three young sisters, of whom the eldest was scarcely twelve years old; finally, that he had put thousands of innocent persons in Bologna and Rome to the torture.

The council rendered the following sentence: "The General Council of Constance, after having invoked the name of Christ and examined the accusations brought against John XXIII., and established on irrefragable proof, pronounces, decrees, and declares, that Balthasar Cossa is the oppressor of the poor, the persecutor of the just, the supporter of knaves, the ideal of simonacs, the slave of the flesh, a sink of vices, a man destitute of every virtue, a mirror of infamy, a devil incarnate: as such, it deposes him from the pontificate, prohibiting all Christians from obeying him and calling him pope. The council further reserves to itself the punishment of his crimes in accordance with the laws of secular justice; and his pursuit as an obstinate and hardened, noxious and incorrigible sinner, whose conduct is abominable and morals infamous: as a simoniac, ravisher, incendiary, disturber of

the peace and union of the Church; as a traitor, murderer, sodomite, poisoner, committer of incest, and corrupter of young nuns and monks!"

The decree of the council contained fifty-four articles, which the bishop of Posania read in public, and twenty other secret ones, so frightful were the crimes which they announced. After this exposure of all John's enormous crimes, the duke of Austria dare no longer support him. To obtain the favor of Sigismund, he betrayed the pope and caused him to be arrested in the town of Ratoffzell. John not only now gave up all hope of regaining the pontificate, but he quietly submitted to the sentence of the council. After having listened to the decree, he affixed his signature to it and approved all its contents. He was then transferred to the fortress of Gatleben; he was stripped of his papal ornaments, and left with only a cook to attend him. He was afterwards taken to the fortress of Heidelburg, where he was kept a prisoner for three years. But his gold again enabled him to effect his escape. The elector palatine was bribed by thirty thousand crowns, and the deposed and disgraced pope fled to the doge of Genoa. But he completely failed in his attempt to rally his old partisans. He then resorted to his old tactics, which had proved so successful against Ladislaus, the king of Naples. The council of Constance had in the meantime made Martin V. the sole and sovereign pope, and he was universally recognized. John's last hope was in taking him off by poison as he had so many others that had stood in his way. He went to Florence and cast himself at the feet of his papal competitor. Martin received him with every outward appearance of joy, and created him cardinal bishop of Foscari; but within two months Balthasar Cossa died of poison. He had himself been forestalled in the use of the cup.

To proceed with a summary account of the Council of Constance: It had healed the disgraceful Western schism by the deposition of three popes, and the election of the fourth. But to the student of history there are matters of infinitely

deeper interest connected with the proceedings of this celebrated council. Having restored peace to the Church, the council next proceeded to crush heresy and reform. To the corrupt members the chief of heretics was John Huss, the bold Bohemian reformer. They determined to smite this pure and gentle man.

At the death of Wickliffe, the morning-star of the Reformation, Huss was a boy of eleven years, and had first read the writings of the great English heresiarch with pious horror. He was a child of poverty, educated among the people. He made his way to the famous university of Prague, and took his place among the poorest of the scholars. His mother accompanied him from his native village, and on the road fell on her knees and recommended him to heaven. The ardent young student, maintained by charity, stored his mind with scholastic learning. He became a preacher. Crowded congregations listened to his glowing language. He inveighed against Rome as the Antichrist, and opposed the burning of Wickliffe's books by the archbishop of Prague. For this he had been summoned before the court of John XXIII. at Bologna, and, refusing to comply, had been excommunicated. He denounced in unmeasured terms the vices and corruptions of the clergy, the shameless license and insolence of the popes and bishops.

All Bohemia finally adopted the opinions of its illustrious son. He was made the rector of the great university, and Prague became the center of a strong impulse toward progress that was felt throughout Europe. His eminent talents and spotless life made him the pride and oracle of the reformers of his age. His gentleness and piety threw around him an irresistible charm, and he became celebrated for his humiliation and kindly grace. His manners had become polished in the society of princes and fair women. Yet he made many bitter enemies in that brutal age.

Upon the assembling of the Council of Constance, Huss was immediately cited to attend it. He was then in the full splendor of his renown. Had he refused the summons,

as he had that of the pope, King Wenceslaus and the powerful barons of Bohemia, who favored his cause, would have protected him. Provided with a safe-conduct from the Emperor Sigismund, which granted him the most solemn guarantee of protection, sustained by the friendship of his king and his country, and strong in his consciousness of innocence, John Huss bid adieu to his disciples, whom he was no more to behold, and set out for Constance in October, 1414. On his journey through Germany he was met and welcomed by immense throngs of people as the champion of human rights. The arch-heretic was even respectfully saluted by ecclesiastics along the road, and entered Constance in triumph. The pope had sworn to protect him; the imperial oath of Sigismund was pledged for his safety, and all Bohemia was watching him with zealous care. He dreamed of no danger.

But he was now in the toils of the Roman monster. Even he did not realize the falsehood and baseness, the savage and unsparing cruelty of the papal Church. The rule was adopted that no faith was to be kept with heretics. In shameful violation of the pope's and emperor's documents of safety, Huss was seized immediately upon his arrival, and cast into a horrible dungeon of the Dominican convent, and chained to the floor. Before proceeding to attack the person of Huss, the council determined to brand the source from which the brave Bohemian had derived his heresy. John Wickliffe had peacefully expired in the very country where his doctrines had been condemned, and his remains still reposed in consecrated ground. The council cited Wickliffe before it, and proceeded against his genius and dead body. After due deliberation, the council declared "that the said Wickliffe died an obstinate heretic, therefore they condemn his memory, and so order his bones to be dug up, if they can be distinguished from the faithful, and thrown upon a dunghill." The zeal of the executioners prompted them to transcend the strict letter of the sentence, when in 1428 they dug the dead reformer's bones from their grave at Sutter-

worth, where they had peacefully reposed for over forty years, burnt them to ashes, and then cast them into a neighboring brook.

And now the council proceeded to consummate one of the most merciless and perfidious acts recorded in the blood-stained annals of popery. It proved to the Emperor Sigismund, from arguments adduced at great length, that he was free to break his faith with a man accused of heresy, and that the council, being above the emperor, could free him from his word. Huss was left to languish for six months in a loathsome cell. After enduring the most cruel abuse and mockery from his persecutors, he was condemned to be burnt alive. On the sixth of July, 1415, he was dragged from his dungeon and led out to condemnation and death. After his executioners had placed on his head a sort of crown, upon which were pictured frightful figures of demons in flames, and upon which was the inscription of "The Arch-Heretic," he was made fast to a stake driven deeply into the ground. It being objected that he was bound with his face to the east, he was untied and fixed again with his face to the west. His head was held fast to the wood by a chain smeared with soot. Fagots were placed about his feet, and around him was piled a quantity of straw. After fire had been set to the pile, Huss prayed and sang a hymn in the midst of his torments. After his voice had been drowned by the roaring of the flames, his head and lips were observed to move as if still praying, until at last he gave up the spirit. The executioners tore in pieces the remains of his body and threw them back upon the fire until absolutely consumed, and then the ashes were thrown into the Rhine. Sigismund attended the horrid ceremonies. Being reminded by a stander-by that the course of the wind might bear an offensive effluvia to the position he occupied, he answered, "The odor of a burning heretic can never be offensive to Sigismund."

Jerome of Prague was one of the most learned and eloquent men of his time. He had studied at Oxford and had brilliantly defended his thesis against the most celebrated univer-

sities of Europe. He had been imprisoned at Vienna as a favorer of Wickliffe. Upon being set at liberty he had gone to join Huss at the university of Prague. As the most illustrious friend of the martyred Huss, Jerome was dragged before the council, was kept chained in a noisome dungeon until his flesh literally rotted off his bones alive, and was at last led forth and tortured to death at the same stake at which Huss had suffered.

The council closed its session in 1418, after having been occupied three years and a half in deposing three papal monsters to make room for another, and in burning the bodies of two living heretics and the buried bones of one dead one. There is nothing in the history of the Romish Church which reflects upon her such indelible disgrace as the proceedings of Constance. It was there that the abominable doctrine that faith is not to be kept with heretics was not only shamelessly declared and most horribly illustrated in the burning of Huss, but was most emphatically established by the council.

The following is extracted from the first of these decrees: "And the person who shall have promised them [persons accused of heresy] security, shall not, in any case, be obliged to keep his promise, by whatsoever tie he may be engaged." From the second of these decrees, which relates to the safe-conduct of Huss in particular, the following is quoted: "And though according to the natural, divine, and human laws, no promise or faith ought to have been kept with him [Huss] to the prejudice of the Catholic faith." The original of these decrees may be consulted on page 491 in the work of L'Enfant, a Romish authority.

This monstrous doctrine was still more shamelessly enjoined by the pope who owed his elevation to the Council of Constance, Martin V., in a bull addressed to Alexander, duke of Lithuania, in 1421, in which he tells the duke "that he would be guilty of a mortal sin should he keep faith with heretics, who are themselves violators of the holy faith, because there can be no fellowship between a believer and unbeliever."

This atrocious doctrine is boldly defended by the universal authority of the Catholic Church. Says Dens: "Nothwithstanding it is not lawful to lie, or to feign what is not, however, it is lawful to dissemble what is, or to cover the truth with words, or other ambiguous or doubtful signs, for a just cause, and when there is not a necessity for confessing" (Theol., vol. ii, p. 116). Again he says: "The Vicar of God, in the place of God, remits to man the debt of a plighted promise" (Ibid., iv, 134, 135). St. Liguori says: "It is certain, and a common opinion among all divines, that for a just cause it is lawful to use equivocation, and to confirm it with an oath" (Less., 1, 2, ch. 41). Pope Urban, elected in 1087, says: "Subjects are not bound to observe the fealty which they swear to a Christian prince who withstands God and the saints, and condemns the precepts" (Pithon, p. 260). Pope Gregory IX. says: "The fealty which subjects have sworn to a Christian king who opposes God and his saints, they are not bound by any authority to perform" (Decret., vol. i. p. 648). Again he says: "An oath contrary to the utility of the Church is not to be observed" (Ibid., ii, p. 358). Again, he asserts: "You are not bound by an oath of this kind, but on the contrary you are freely bid good-speed in standing against kings for the rights and honors of that very Church, and even in legislatively defending your peculiar privileges" (p. 360).

Dean Waddington, in his "History of the Church," page 458, makes the following just remarks relative to the burning of Huss and the violation of the safe-conduct: "The guilt of the murder was enhanced by perfidy; and for the purpose of justifying this last offense, they added to those principles another not less flagitious than those already recognized, that neither faith nor promise, by natural, divine, or human law, was to be observed to the prejudice of the Catholic religion. This maxim did not proceed from the caprice of an arbitrary individual, and a pope—for so it would scarcely have claimed our serious notice; but from the considerate resolution of a very numerous assembly, which embodied almost all the learning, wisdom, and moderation of the Roman Catholic Church."

The above is a naked narrative of facts concerning John XXIII. and the Council of Constance. In the collection of them great care has been taken in the consultation of all the standard and authentic works on the general and ecclesiastical history of the age in which the transactions took place. References have been made to the bulls of popes and the decrees of councils, and important facts gleaned from such standard historians as Hallam, De Cormenin, L'Enfant, Dens, Dupin, Dowling, Mosheim, and Bellarmine. The life of John and the proceedings of the Council of Constance present a synopsis of Catholic Christianity. John XXIII., convicted of more than seventy different sorts of crime, may be considered the incarnation of all the monstrous vices that characterized his predecessors.

Through the ghostly grandeur and glamour which have invested the lives of the long line of pontiffs, the impartial student of history discerns only the features of the arch-fiend. All the offspring of the mother Church have been heirs of hell rather than human beings. And the Church itself, divested of its imposing pomp, its magnificent mummeries and supernatural splendor, its chimes and chants, crosiers and crosses and crowns, mitres and missals and masses, its robes and relics, rosaries and rituals, and its grand cathedrals, gilded and groined and glittering with gold; divested of the peculiar fascination of a history which takes the mind back along the pathway of the ages to the time when idols were worshiped in Mecca, and Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch; this Church, which was great and respected before the Frank passed the Rhine, or the Saxon set foot in Britain; stripped of the veil which so long has hidden her hideous deformity, is found to be, like the apocalyptic Babylon, "the habitation of devils, the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird."

MARTIN V.

THIS, the two hundred and thirteenth pope, was a Roman by birth, and was of the ancient and noble family of the Colonna, which had already given so many bad and execrable pontiffs to the people. He was the son of Agapet Colonna, called the Roman prince, and had been created cardinal by Urban VI. Authorities differ as to his character. Platinus accords to him great qualities—extreme amenity and a remarkable skill in the conduct and management of State affairs. On the other hand, Leonard Arctin, who was secretary of the apostolic chamber, maintains that the holy Father was notoriously incompetent, and that he had a violent disposition. Windeck, the counsellor of Sigismund, reconciles these two contradictory opinions by saying, "Cardinal Otho Colonna was poor and good; but Pope Martin V. became avaricious and cruel."

The news of the election of Martin V. was hailed with joy in all parts of the Christian world. Nations which had been divided in their belief for fifty years submitted to the new pope. The cardinals of Benedict XIII. themselves abandoned that obstinate old man to go to Constance; and, to increase their happiness, the Fathers of the council learned that Gregory XII. had died from a burst of passion. Martin resolved to take advantage of the circumstances, and not allow the enthusiasm to cool before he had made a party for his own interests and purposes. He sent the cardinal of Pisa, Alcman Adamar, to Spain to induce the king of Aragon to constrain Benedict, by secular penalties, to submit to the decisions of the assembly of Constance. The legate was charged to fulminate bulls of anathema against the antipopes

and the two Spanish cardinals who remained faithful to him.

Like a shrewd trickster, Alphonso was willing to sell his pope for a good price, and pledged himself to deliver him to the agents of Martin on the conditions that the holy Father would cede to him in perpetuity the tithes on ecclesiastical property in his kingdom, and the right of disposing of the benefices of Sardinia and Sicily without being compelled to render any account to the holy see, with other stipulated rights and privileges. Martin did not approve of his revenues being reduced, and refused the propositions.

This course drew upon Martin the hatred of the Spaniards who still remained at the Council. A formidable party was formed against him; several cardinals even wished to depose him, and published violent satires against him. Among all these productions, the "Mass of Simony" was the most lively and cutting critique which, up to that time, had been written against the papacy. The following are some of the extracts from it:

"A young priest went on a pilgrimage to visit St. Peter's at Rome. When he arrived in the holy city he perceived a splendid palace, which was more elevated than the highest churches, and which workmen were constantly endeavoring to raise higher. Having inquired the name of the master of this magnificent edifice, he was told, It is Simon the Robber, the only god now adored in the Church: come officiate at his altar. He was then conducted into a cavern, in which he saw heaps of gold and silver, and on an altar three young naked females crowned with myrtle, and holding in their hands cups and garlands of flowers. Then the divine sacrifice commenced, and he pronounced the following words:

"INTROIT.—In the name of licentiousness, pride, and avarice, I will not love, serve, nor adore any, save the god of gold, which alone procures for us all enjoyment on this earth.

"COLLECT.—I will employ every moment of my life in seeking new modes of oppressing the people, since it is just that stupid men, who believe our lies, should be despoiled.

"LECTURE.—It is written in the Apocalypse, the angel who

had the seven horns appeared in the west, mounted upon a pale courser; he went before a kind of monster, half man, half woman, which had no clothing on, and was covered about the head with only a tiara with a triple crown. This apparition was seated on a beast which had the form of an immense dragon, and whose folds were covered with a scarlet nap; in each hand it held an urn, filled with the oil of fornication, which it poured out on its way.

"CONFITEOR.—I confess that I love only gold, and that I am capable of committing every crime, in thought and deed, to rob men. Amen."

This satire was handed to Martin by the embassadors of the king of Aragon, in full audience. He then saw it was necessary for him to at once break up the assembly of Constance if he did not wish to expose himself to the fate of John XXIII. Before taking this extreme step, however, he wished to alarm the weaker minds by some terrible execution, and continued against several disciples of John Huss the proceedings which had been interrupted by the judgment of John XXIII., and made a magnificent *auto da fe*. When something grand and worthy the approval of God's vicegerent and best calculated to give pleasure to the faithful saints was wanted, the burning of a generous number of heretics seemed to be the manner selected as the best means of accomplishing the ends in view.

Soon after this the holy Father announced his determination of leaving Constance; and in vain did the emperor and others urge him to remain until the differences were settled which existed between the altar and the throne. The emperor offered him his choice between the cities of Strasburg, Basle, or Mayence as a residence, but in vain. All entreaties were useless. The pope remained immovable in his resolution: and, to put an end to the solicitations, he fulminated a bull, prohibiting all Christians from appealing from his decisions, or even discussing his motives, maintaining that a pope was the absolute judge of his own actions in all circumstances, and that he could annul the promises which he

had previously made. Thus he adhered to his determination of leaving Constance, and the next day he declared the council dissolved, and commanded that the cardinals and the officers of the holy see should take the road to Geneva, where he had decided to hold his court until the moment of his departure for Rome.

On the sixteenth of May, 1418, Martin left Constance, and his train surpassed in magnificence all that had been seen before it. The procession was led off by twelve counts of the empire, mounted on white horses, richly caparisoned and covered with scarlet housings. These were followed by twelve pages, carrying on the ends of long pikes, cardinal's hats; after these came four priests, sustaining a dais, beneath which was a bishop who carried the holy sacrament. Then came twelve cardinals in their rich scarlet costume, mounted on mules entirely covered with gold and brocade. Behind these a metropolitan, clothed in episcopal attire. He was also beneath a dais, supported by eight abbots on horseback. Next came Fuzatius, the celebrated theologian of Westphalia, carrying a cross glittering with precious stones. He was surrounded by the canons and senators of the city, who carried lighted candles in their hands. Then appeared the august and haughty Martin V., with his tiara on his head, mounted on a horse, of which the housings were of purple and gold. Four princes and four dukes carried above him a dais adorned with fringe of gold. The emperor walked on foot, holding the right side of the reins and having at his side Louis, duke of Bavaria, who held one of the tassels of the housings of the horse; the elector of Brandenburg held the reins on the left side, and Frederic of Austria carried the tassel of the housing. Four princes walked on foot on each side and sustained with golden cords the middle and extremities of the housing. Behind the pope came his parasol-bearer; then marched in squadrons, on foot and on horseback, nobles, soldiers, priests, monks, all the trades, and, as a necessary appendage, the seven hundred and eighteen courtesans of the council, dressed in white and marching in pairs.

As soon as the cortege, which contained more than forty thousand persons, had passed the suburbs of the city, Martin put on a traveling garment, mounted a saddle-horse, and continued his route to Gotleben still accompanied by the emperor and the princes. The pope and his cardinals embarked on the Rhine and descended to Schaffhausen, from thence to Basle, and finally to Geneva. After reposing two months at the Abbey of the Cordeliers, the pope and his cardinals crossed the Alps into Milan, where he was received with great honors. He avoided Bologna, for there the people had declared their independence of him. His reception in Florence was not cordial; the children turned out and sang a satire, "Pope Martin is not worth a quatrino" (a small piece of money). He remained in Florence for some time. It was during his sojourn at that place that John XXIII., who had been detained in prison for three years at Heidelburg, but had escaped by paying the elector palatine thirty thousand crowns in gold, and had gone to Genoa to the doge, finally changed his tactics and came to Martin and cast himself at the feet of his competitor, acknowledging him as the rightful pope, and this to the great astonishment of his cardinals who did not understand his strange conduct. Martin received John with every appearance of joy, made him magnificent presents, created him a cardinal-bishop of Frascati, and assigned to him comfortable pensions on the treasury of St. Peter. Two months after this, the infamous Balthasar Cossa —John XXIII.—whom the pope knew was a bitter and secret enemy of his, was poisoned.

Freed from this dreaded adversary, Martin decided to leave Florence, and repaired to Rome. He intended to place the former city under papal interdict by excommunication, and had not his secretary, Aretin, persuaded him from such a course, he would have executed his design. Instead of cursing them, he pronounced a blessing, and this was the way he repaid the enormous sums of money he had borrowed. He was gladly received in Rome, especially by the priests, who had greatly lost caste in the long absence of the pope.

The churches had become devastated, the monasteries were in ruins, and the faithful brought no more offerings to the Madonna and the saints for miracles. Martin applied himself to repair the disasters that had occurred; he restored churches, constructed new monasteries, and did so well in such directions that in less than a year Rome was more resplendent than it had ever been.

A complication of troubles arose consequent upon the expulsion of the cruel duke of Bourbon, husband of Joanna II., the sister of Ladislaus. The pope called Louis III., duke of Anjou, into Italy, invested him, by virtue of his omnipotence, with the crown of Naples, on condition that he would restore to his see the ancient rights and privileges for benefices, collations, tithes, prebends, and other perquisites. This offer induced Louis to raise a large army for the purpose. Joanna thus placed in danger, called to her aid Alphonso, king of Aragon, and adopted him as her son and heir in order to attach him to her cause. He sent at once numerous troops to Naples. He came, flourished, and the holy Father was reduced to such distress that Braccia wrote that in less than a month the pope should be compelled to say masses at six deniers each to gain subsistence. Martin himself, seeing that he could not long resist his formidable adversary, had recourse to perfidy. He entered into secret negotiations with Alphonso, and induced him to dethrone the queen, promising to sanction his usurpation and to obtain from Louis of Anjou a renunciation on advantageous terms.

To carry out the conspiracy, Alphonso went to queen Joanna in person, and, under the pretext of relieving her from the burden of affairs he seized on the sovereign authority and performed many acts of usurpation. Among other plans was to carry off the queen and confine her in a prison in Spain. But the plot failed. The queen, notwithstanding all her debauchery, knew how to keep the love of her people. She knew also how to oppose craft to knavery. She retook the reins of government, reinstated governors, shut herself up in a strong castle, and gradually recovered the power that had

been assumed by Alphonso. The latter, perceiving that his plans had been frustrated, threw off the mask of hypocrisy and attacked the seneschal John Carracciolo, one of the lovers of the queen, when entering the port of Capua, and even endeavored to seize the fortress. This effort failed, a crowd hastened to the aid of Joanna and fell upon the Aragonese and made great carnage among them. In revenge the Aragonese set fire to the four corners of the city, and favored by the fire they rushed upon the Neapolitans and massacred them by thousands. Alphonso attacked the fortress where the queen was but could not prevail over the zeal and courage of the people who fought under the order of her captain, and she was saved. A few days afterwards, however, learning that Bernardo de Cabrera was coming from Catalonia with a fleet and reinforcements, she departed in the night under the escort of Sforza and five thousand citizens. Alphonso thus became absolute master of Naples. He wrote at once to the pope informing him of the success of his plans, and claiming from the holy Father the title of king of Naples, and the deposition of Joanna.

His holiness replied readily, and had the effrontery to tell Alphonso that he, Martin, had no intention of fulfilling the promises he had made; that Louis of Anjou, as the heir of his father, was the lawful sovereign of the kingdom; that he had bought the investiture of it from popes Alexander V. and John XXIII., and he had himself confirmed the act by approving the council of Constance; and moreover, Louis never having done anything against the holy see, he declined to take away his kingdom and give it to a prince who had granted his protection to the antipope Peter de Luna. Such a breach of faith outraged the sovereign of Aragon and in revenge he resolved to cause Benedict to be recognized as the lawful pontiff through all Italy. But while he was taking measures to overthrow Martin, the latter by a new act of treachery was making proposals to Joanna to furnish her the means of returning to her capital if she would consent to annul the adoption of Alphonso and substitute Louis of

Anjou in his place. Before taking her determination the queen made an exchange of prisoners with Alphonso and got back her favorite Carracciolo; as she had nothing more to gain she complied with the pope's demands and adopted Louis of Anjou, and united her troops with those of that prince to combat Alphonso, their common enemy.

Affairs with Alphonso went on then from bad to worse, and, being reduced to the last extremity, he was compelled to return to Spain to recruit his army. His first act upon returning home was to publish a solemn recognition of Benedict as the successor of the apostle and the lawful pontiff in order to draw the rest of the peninsula into the party of the other claimant Peter de Luna. This step placed the dearest interests of Martin in danger, and he wrote to the cardinal of Pisa, his legate in Aragon, either to seize the person of the antipope, or to take such measures as would leave nothing to be dreaded from him. His orders were faithfully obeyed. The cardinal carried out the instructions of the head of the Church in the true Christian spirit which ruled at that time. In less than a month Benedict XIII., who claimed to be the lawful successor of St. Peter, was poisoned by a monk who obeyed the legate of Martin. The poison cup thus proved itself, as in so many other cases, a potent agent in removing impediments, and the head of the Christians was again a virtual assassin. The wretched monk who committed the foul deed was arrested and condemned to be quartered, but before the execution he solemnly declared he had acted under the instructions of the cardinal of Pisa and the instigations of the pontiff himself.

Benedict was a vigorous and determined man. Abandoned by princes and people, and having only a fortress for a residence, situated on a tongue of land that ran out into the sea, he launched forth his spiritual bolts from the bosom of the elementary tumult and amidst the roar of thunder. In the midst of his dying convulsions and the agony of death he preserved great presence of mind and energy. He showed no weakness or vacillation. He enjoined the two cardinals

who remained faithful to him to give him a successor. In accordance with these orders, after the death of Benedict, Giles Munoz, of Aragon, was declared pope by the two cardinals; and, under the title of Clement VIII., he was placed in the papal chair, and he created cardinals in accordance with the practice of his predecessors. Alphonso warmly acknowledged the new pope throughout all his possessions, and endeavored to induce other sovereigns to recognize him and to place kingdoms under his control.

Martin very naturally became alarmed at this threatening rival, and he dispatched to the king of Aragon his legate, Peter, Cardinal de Foix, to offer Alphonso peace if he would abandon his antipope. But Alphonso, who had so abundantly experienced the perfidy of Martin, refused to receive his embassador, and even published edicts against Martin, prohibiting all the prelates of his kingdom, under penalty of confiscation of their goods, from receiving a bull from Rome and from communing with Martin's legate.

Unable to succeed by treachery, Martin tried most violent means, and on the fifteenth of July, 1425, he fulminated a bull against the king of Aragon, declaring him to be an enemy of religion, a supporter of the schism, and, as such, deprived him of all his properties and dignities. This apostolic policy succeeded the better as Louis of Anjou and Joanna of Naples had driven the troops of Alphonso out of the kingdom of Naples. This success obtained, Martin kindled the fire of discord in upper Italy, and used the ambitious Philip Marie Visconti, duke of Milan, to aid him in subjugating it. At the command of the holy Father, the duke declared war on all the Italian republics, and carried fire and blood into Florence, against which State Martin entertained the most bitter and implacable hatred. But the Florentines, being wholly ignorant of the foul designs which his Holiness entertained towards them, sent an embassy to Rome to implore the protection of the holy Father, and to remind him of the services they had formerly done him. He, of course, refused to give them aid, and, adding insolence to refusal, he

said: "You will see if Pope Martin is not worth a quatrino." It was then proved that the pleasantry of the children of Florence on a former occasion, rankled in the breast of the pope, and this was the only cause of the deadly hatred he felt towards the people of Florence. This man, to avenge the vanity of a malicious and treacherous representative of a God of pity, covered entire provinces with woeful disaster, caused the blood of thousands of inoffensive people to flow, and multitudes of innocent persons to be massacred; and it is through such despicable criminals as this vile Martin V. that the Christian Church has been perpetuated for hundreds of years.

The reign of carnage and blood extended into Germany. Already, at the Council of Constance, Martin had shown himself to be the most bitter enemy of John Huss and Jerome of Prague; and afterwards, in the synod of Pavia, he stood forth the deadly persecutor of their disciples. He issued a terrible decree against them, in which he enjoined on the emperor, the ecclesiastical and secular princes of Germany, and the king of Poland to unite their armies to exterminate all the people of Bohemia who had embraced the doctrines of John Huss, their fellow-countryman. He gladly, to carry out his intense feeling of hatred towards those who dared to embrace views that suited them, in opposition to his rule, would have devastated their entire country, and caused the terrible death by butchery of every man, woman, and child in it; but, fortunately, his bulls did not possess very remarkable force over the princes of Germany, and the wicked pope was compelled to fall back on the bishop of Winchester, England, one of his creatures: and he conferred a cardinalate upon him on condition that he would recruit an army, at his own expense, to enter Bohemia and murder and subdue the followers of Huss. The ambitious English cardinal thus vilely created accepted the bargain and at once set himself at preaching a crusade under the banner of the pope. He assembled a band of wretches and banditti, placed himself at their head, and entered Bohemia to carry out the behests of the representative of the

mild and amiable Prince of Peace. But the Hussites were brave and valorous; they boldly met the army of the English cardinal, as well as the army of Italians which were sent on by the pope. Their homes and their altars were endangered, and their enemies were defeated with a loss of more than ten thousand men, the remainder fleeing in the greatest terror and throwing away their arms. The English attempted a feeble resistance. The cardinal endeavored to entrench himself in the town of Tausch and wait for reinforcements, but he was again defeated; the Bohemians attacked the place and put to death all the Italian, German, French, and English soldiers. The cardinal, with difficulty, escaped in disguise.

Although the pope had not succeeded in spreading the desolation over Bohemia that he desired, he had met with a partial success. He had kindled a civil war in Germany, and, after the defeat alluded to, he wrote thus to his legate to restore his courage: "We have heard the news of your defeat with great grief, and we are the more dismayed at it since it will contribute not a little to increase the strength and insolence of the heretics. We cannot too much praise your zeal, my dear son. We hope that this blow of fortune will not abate your energy; that you will persevere in the *holy* enterprise you have commenced; and that you will immediately recruit new troops to recommence hostilities and to wash out, in the blood of the Hussites, the opprobrium with which your name is covered. Let no consideration arrest you; spare neither money nor men. Believe that we are acting for religion, and that God has no more agreeable holocaust than the blood of his enemies. Strike with the sword, and when your arm cannot reach the guilty, employ poison. Burn all the towns of Bohemia, that the fire may purify that accursed land; transform the country into arid steppes, and let the dead bodies of the heretics hang from the trees in greater numbers than the leaves of the forest."

Can a policy be imagined more infernal and bloodthirsty than is here seen to have emanated from the pen of an occupant of the chair of St. Peter, one of the pillars of the sys-

tem of Christianity, one of the vicegerents of God and his peaceful Son? It was more fitting an infuriated demon, an insatiate monster, constantly thirsting for the blood of innocence.

Prescribed limits will not allow the giving in detail all the acts of treachery, knavery, and cruelty of Martin, and much will needs be passed over in silence. In 1429 he entered into negotiations with Alphonso, whom he had so much injured, and this was done for the purpose of suppressing the anti-pope Clement VIII., who, as a rival, had incurred his most intense hatred. It should be recorded of the good man, Giles Munoz, who had been induced to accept the title of pope, that it was not a position of his own seeking, and that he resigned the honors with great willingness. Thus terminated, on the twenty-sixth of July, 1429, the great western schism, which had commenced on the twenty-first of September, 1378, and had torn to pieces all the Christian kingdoms for more than fifty years. The fierce contentions, wars, carnage, and bloodshed that grew out of it were anything but fitting for what is claimed to be the best system of religion the world has ever known, and whose mission has been to civilize, elevate, and enlighten the world, but is more fitting for the worst class of tyrants, cut-throats, and monsters that ever drew the breath of life.

Martin having become, by this peaceful withdrawal, the tranquil possessor of the chair of St. Peter, was occupied in regaining the preponderance he had lost, and availed himself of the assembling of the congress of Luckow, in Poland, to induce Wladislaus to take a vigorous resolve against the Hussites, in opposition to whom the most inveterate hatred still rankled in his bosom. He addressed the following letter to the prince upon the subject:

"The grand actions which you have accomplished since your baptism, my lord, and the zeal which you have shown for our holy religion in imposing your belief on idolatrous nations, give us hopes that you will persist in the same way, and will bring back to the fold of the Church the Christians

of Bohemia, whom the abominable John Huss has drawn into schism. Know that the interest of the holy see, and those of your crown, make it a duty to exterminate the Hussites. Remember that these impious persons dare proclaim principles of equality. They maintain that all Christians are brethren, and that God has not given to privileged men the right of ruling the nations; they hold that Christ came on earth to abolish slavery; they call the people to liberty, that is, to the annihilation of kings and priests! Whilst there is still time, then, turn your forces against Bohemia; burn, massacre, make deserts everywhere, for nothing could be more agreeable to God, or more useful to the cause of kings, than the extermination of the Hussites."

In consequence of the orders of the court of Rome, a new crusade was preached against the Bohemians, with promises of indulgence to those who would take up arms; but this expedition, which was the sixth enterprise for the extinction of Hussism, was not more fortunate than its predecessors; the Catholic forces were annihilated, and liberty triumphed.

When this bad news reached the holy Father, he was engaged in the nomination of a legate, whom he was to send to Basle to preside over the general council and take proceedings against the heretics. His anger and mortification knew no bounds. He was struck with a fit of apoplexy, and expired on the twentieth of February, 1431, after a reign of four years.

Among the many culpable acts of this pope, it will be remembered that at the Council of Constance he advocated the digging up of the bones of John Wickliffe, the martyr-heretic of England, and burning them to show the undying hatred which the Church bore to the principles of religious liberty. His memory must be retained to the latest generations as an ambitious, treacherous, cruel, relentless champion of a most corrupt Church, and one who was willing to commit the private assassination of an enemy and to cause the slaughter of thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children to establish his power and to exalt his holy religion.

PAUL II.

In the year 1464, upon the death of Pius II., the college of cardinals chose Peter Barbo to preside over the destinies of the Church. After having proved his manhood, or, more properly, his masculinity by submitting to the test of the perforated chair—a test which must have lent new dignity and splendor to the Vicar of Christ and Lieutenant of the Almighty—Peter Barbo was consecrated, and assumed the pontifical duties under the name of Paul II. Before his consecration the cardinals exacted of him an oath that he would comply with the following conditions: To continue the collection of dimes, which had been a source of immense revenue to his predecessor; not to elevate any of his relatives to the cardinalate; not to increase the number of cardinals to more than twenty-four; to submit the promotions and depositions of prelates to the sanction of the sacred college; not to alienate any part of the patrimonies of the Church or the revenues of the holy see; not to make peace or war with princes or nations without the approval of the cardinals; that important places should not be governed by his relatives; that the army of the Church should never be commanded by a member of his family; and many others of minor importance. They also required him to read this constitution or guarantee of rights every month in full consistory, for the purpose of keeping it fresh in his mind; and they also imposed upon him the condition of permitting them to assemble twice each year to investigate his observance of the conditions.

Once secure in position as sovereign pontiff, he exhibited his understanding of the term "infallibility" by freeing himself from all responsibility to the college of cardinals. Being

infallible he did not require their counsel. He appointed friends and relatives to fill lucrative positions, in direct violation of his oath. He framed laws for the government of the Church to suit himself, and when he presented them to the cardinals for ratification, he forewarned them that those who refused to comply with his demands would be at once deposed. The cardinals were forced to submit to his despotic sway. They had made him pope, and they could not depose him. But the power was his to make and unmake cardinals.

It was easy to purchase with money the protection of the holy Paul from the consequences—either in this world or the next—of any species of iniquity or villainy. With him, as with many of his predecessors and successors, gold was God made manifest.

Henry of Castile, a profligate and pusillanimous prince, had been forced from his throne because of his debauchery, and his brother Alphonso reigned in his stead. Making up for the weakness of his cause by the strength of his bribes, he sought the aid of Paul in an effort to regain the throne he had forfeited by his enormities. Paul at once declared Henry absolved from all his many crimes, ordered his subjects to resume their old allegiance, and launched most terrible anathemas against Alphonso. The bishop of Leon was dispatched to the court of Madrid as bearer of the papal bull, but Alphonso not only declined to grant him an audience but ordered him to leave his dominions at once under penalty of forfeiting his life, informing him that he desired no pontifical interference with the political affairs of his kingdom, and that he would appeal to a future council against the attacks of the pope. The envoy of the pope not daring to publish the bull of the pontiff, nor even to remain in Castile, returned in haste to Rome and apprised Paul of the result of his mission. Paul upbraided him for his pusillanimousness and ordered him to return immediately to Castile and "menace the rebels with all the calamities of divine justice, and to set aside a king whom they had crowned." The pope was obeyed. His legate returned secretly to Madrid. The calamity of "divine jus-

tice" was visited upon the prince, and the young Alphonso suddenly died of poison. The king whom the Castilians had chosen was thus "set aside," and Henry, under the protection of this representative of the Biblical God, remounted his throne.

Platinus, the learned Italian historian, at one time librarian of the Vatican, took the liberty of addressing a letter to Paul, protesting against his many arbitrary acts and his violation of the constitution which he had sworn to respect. Paul at once declared the writing of this letter to be an act of felony, and ordered the unfortunate Platinus to be arrested. Says De Cormenin:

"The house of Platinus was one night surrounded by his soldiers, his furniture pillaged, his papers carried off, and he himself dragged from his bed and led in chains before his persecutor. His holiness proceeded at once to interrogate him, and caused him to be put to the torture. By his orders the sufferer was despoiled of his garments, and conducted into a vaulted hall, separated into two parts by a partition of glass. In one of these chambers were the pope and his counsellors, mixed up with the executioners; in the other were placed heated braziers, which kept up a boiling in immense vessels full of water, which rendered any stay in it insupportable. In the midst was a post three feet high, terminating in a diamond point. To the ceiling were fastened five cords. The punishment over which the holy Father presided was that of the 'heated chamber.'

"Platinus was bound by his four members and his reins and raised above the stake, the point of which was introduced into his anus. They then drew the cords so that he was bent double and all the weight of his body rested on the axis of the stake. The heated braziers were fixed close to him, and a glass, which reflected all this horrid scene, was placed before him, so as to double in some sort his punishment. Paul, surrounded by his minions and favorites, continued the examination of Platinus through the partition, and only stopped to make cynical allusions to the pale which tore

the entrails of his victim so cruelly. Notwithstanding the atrocious sufferings he underwent, the sufferer having nothing which he was willing to avow, they were obliged to take him down, and the pope caused his place to be occupied by others. All underwent frightful tortures; and no one having accused Platinus they were then compelled to abandon the charge of a crime against the State and seek some other pretext to destroy the impudent censor of the pope. His holiness accused him of heresy, and ordered the executioners to renew their punishments to force the accused to admit this new crime.

"Almost all these unfortunate men expired on the rack, after having been torn with iron pincers or broken with blows from a bar of iron. The historian Platinus alone, thanks to his moral energy and the strong constitution with which he was endowed, defied the rage of his executioners and survived these horrid tortures. He even afterwards recovered his liberty on the express demand of the Emperor Frederic III."

Pride, avarice, cruelty, lubricity, and vanity were the most prominent characteristics of this pious Champion of the Christian Church. So great was his vanity that he is said to have passed hours at a time in adorning himself with laces and jewelry and in covering his face with paint and cosmetics. The last years of his life were passed in endeavoring to excite troubles in France, Bohemia, Poland, Spain, and Italy, and in enforcing his demands for the pontifical perquisites—tenths or tithes of the wealth of the people. But his success in this respect was not remarkable. He had too many and too powerful opponents among the sovereigns of Europe.

He died on the night of the twenty-ninth of July, 1447, a victim of his gluttonous intemperance.

"Religion ought to annihilate science, because science is the enemy of religion," was the favorite maxim of Paul; and, acting upon this maxim, he was always a persistent and determined opponent of education and science. From this text he preached by deed as well as word, during the seven years of his pontificate, and from this text Christianity has

been preaching down to the present day. No longer ago than the month of December, 1877, one of the leading theologians of America, in a public lecture, used the following language:

"Where stand now our scientific men? In the front ranks of the Infidel army. This is called an enlightened age; I call it an age of darkness where we shall worship ere long reason alone and deny our God! I may startle you when I say that there is more danger to religion in too much learning than in ignorance; and without the care and warnings of the Church, man drifts into Atheism and dangerous doctrines."

The expression, "There is more danger to religion in too much learning than in ignorance," is Paul's maxim softened to suit the waning power of the Church and the growing power of science. But the underlying spirit is the same. The Church is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. No book of science that was placed upon the Index Expurgatorius by the Church has ever been removed therefrom. To this day the works of Nicholas Copernicus are forbidden to the faithful. Though the Protestant schism of the Christian Church may lay claim to greater liberality, the difference is merely of degree, not of kind.

After the last of those gilded figure-heads of the sinking slave-ship of popery, the Roman pontiffs, shall have sunk beneath the surface of the ocean of science; after the last of those theological club-houses of the multifarious Christian creeds, the churches, chapels, and cathedrals, shall have been converted into temples of learning for the education of humanity; after our present so-called civilized nations shall have ceased to pray to an unknown God to assist them while they prey upon each other; after all these changes shall have taken place, the half-civilized natives of the wilds of Africa, whose intellectual development shall have elevated them to the mental plane of our present orthodox believers, will gather in their chapels and churches and chant in solemn and sanctimonious chorus that maxim of Paul and key-note of Christianity, "Religion ought to annihilate science because science is the enemy of religion."

TORQUEMADA.

THOMAS DE TORQUEMADA, one of the most relentless, vigilant, bigoted, and cruel zealots who endeavored to promote the religion of Jesus by causing widespread human suffering and wholesale destruction of human life, was born at Torquemada, Spain, in the year 1420. He became a Dominican monk and prior of the monastery of Santa Cruz, at Segovia, and ultimately confessor and spiritual adviser of Queen Isabella of Castile, wife of Ferdinand V. He wielded a great influence over her naturally pious and superstitious mind: and when—about the year 1480—he wished to introduce the holy Inquisition into Spain for the suppression of heresy and crushing from the human breast the liberty of thought and opinion upon religious subjects, he found his wishes seconded by Queen Isabella, and he was appointed first inquisitor-general of Spain in 1481. He was confirmed in the position by Pope Innocent VIII., who gave him also the title of "Confessor of Sovereigns." The Inquisition had been found a very effective means of suppressing heresy and private opinion in southern France at an earlier date; the rack, the pulley, the thumbscrew, the boot, and the numerous infernal devices that human ingenuity had devised, had been discovered to exert a very persuasive influence in causing accused persons to abandon their independent views and to make them conform precisely to the rule prescribed by their merciless tormentors and murderers Torquemada felt a burning desire to set this diabolical machinery at work within his own country, that his fellow-citizens, neighbors, and kinsmen, if need be, might be benefited by its blessed effects. That he became a most resolute and unyielding operator and director in the manipula-

tion of this infernal machinery, the tens and hundreds of thousands who were brought within the reach of his arm of power were made most decidedly to feel.

He labored with great vigor and success in organizing the Inquisition throughout Spain, especially at Seville, Cordova, Jaen, and Ciudad Real. He drew up the code of procedure subsequently followed, and was the impelling power that kept the hellish engine in active operation. He was one of the prime movers in the cruel expulsion of the Jews and Moors from Spain. He established also the *auto da fé*, in which he took great pleasure as being the most god-like agency for producing unity of thought and a perfect submission to the ruling ecclesiastical power that had ever been devised. In the eighteen years in which his power was supreme in the conduct of the "Holy Inquisition," numerous historians agree that he, with the aid of his pious coadjutors, burned at the stake from 8,000 to 12,000 persons, burned 7,000 in effigy, caused the imprisonment for life of 90,000 more, and tortured to the utmost point of endurable cruelty some 100,000 more. In addition to all this, this human hyena caused thousands of graves to be robbed of the bones there deposited, which were burned to powder, in consequence of the wicked heresy the departed ones were thought to have been guilty of. It will thus be seen that he ruled with a high and heavy hand until even the vile and criminal pope, Alexander VI.—to whose sketch the reader is referred—becoming touched with the terrible scourge that Torquemada visited upon the people, evinced a modicum of mercy, and curtailed the authority of the sublime inquisitor-general by appointing four colleagues to divide the power with him, and, in fact, to curtail the hideous excesses which the man of God was committing in such a wholesale and merciless manner.

The means employed by the Inquisition of bringing accused parties before it were of the most villainous and demoniacal character. A class of insinuating, inquisitive persons called *familiars* were employed to pry into the secrets of families and individuals; and were by them brought before the

court of terror at all hours of the day and night. "Anonymous accusations were received; the accused were not confronted by witnesses; torture of the most terrible kind was relied upon for conviction; and the same was inflicted in vaults and under-ground rooms where no one could hear the cries of the tormented. As, in pretended mercy, it was forbidden to inflict torture a second time, with horrible duplicity it was affirmed that the torment had not been completed at first, but had only been suspended out of charity until the following day. The families of the afflicted were plunged into irretrievable ruin." A few paragraphs descriptive of the mode of the Inquisition from Prescott's "Ferdinand and Isabella," commencing p. 255, vol. i., will here be given:

"Edicts were ordered to be published annually on the first two Sundays in Lent, throughout the churches, enjoining it as a sacred duty on all who knew or suspected another to be guilty of heresy to lodge information against him before the Holy Office; and the ministers of religion were instructed to refuse absolution to such as hesitated to comply with this, although the suspected person might stand in the relation of parent, child, husband, or wife. All accusations, anonymous as well as signed, were admitted, it being only necessary to specify the names of the witnesses, whose testimony was taken down in writing by a secretary and afterwards read to them, which, unless the inaccuracies were so gross as to enforce themselves upon their attention, they seldom failed to confirm.

"The accused, in the meantime, whose mysterious disappearance was perhaps the only public evidence of his arrest, was conveyed to the secret chambers of the Inquisition, where he was jealously excluded from intercourse with all, save a priest of the Romish Church and his jailer, both of whom might be regarded as the spies of the tribunal. In this desolate condition, the unfortunate man, cut off from all external communication and all cheering sympathy or support, was kept for some time in ignorance even of the charges preferred against him; and at length, instead of the original process, was

favored only with the extracts from the depositions of the witnesses, so garbled as to conceal every possible clue to their name and quality. With still greater unfairness, no mention whatever was made of such testimony as had arisen in course of the examination in his own favor. Counsel was indeed allowed from a list presented by the judges. But this privilege availed little, since the parties were not permitted to confer together, and the advocate was furnished with no other source of information than what had been granted to his client. To add to the injustice of these proceedings, every discrepancy in the statements of the witnesses was converted into a separate charge against the prisoner, who thus, instead of one crime, stood accused of several. This, taken in connection with the concealment of time, place, and circumstances in the accusations, created such embarrassment that unless the accused possessed unusual acuteness and presence of mind it was sure to involve him, in his attempts to explain, in inextricable contradiction.

"If the prisoner refused to confess his guilt, or, as was usual, was suspected of evasion or attempt to conceal the truth, he was subjected to the torture. This, which was administered in the deepest vaults of the Inquisition, where the cries of the victim could fall on no ear save that of his tormentors, is admitted by the secretary of the Holy Office, who has furnished the most authentic report of its transactions, not to have been exaggerated in any of the numerous narratives which have dragged these subterranean horrors into light. If the intensity of pain extorted a confession from the sufferer, he was expected, if he survived, which did not always happen, to confirm it on the next day. Should he refuse to do this, his mutilated members were condemned to a repetition of the same sufferings, until his obstinacy (it should rather have been termed heroism) might be vanquished. Should the rack, however, prove ineffectual to enforce a confession of his guilt, he was so far from being considered as having established his innocence that, with a barbarity unknown to any tribunal where the torture had been admit-

ted, and which of itself proves its utter incompetency to the ends it proposes, he was not unfrequently convicted on the depositions of the witnesses. At the conclusion of his mock trial, the prisoner was again returned to his dungeon, where, without the blaze of a single fagot to dispel the cold or illuminate the darkness of the long winter night, he was left in unbroken silence to await the doom which was to consign him to an ignominious death or a life scarcely less ignominious.

"The proceedings of the tribunal, as I have stated them, were plainly characterized throughout by the most flagrant injustice and inhumanity to the accused. Instead of presuming his innocence until his guilt had been established, it acted on exactly the opposite principle. Instead of affording him the protection accorded by every other judicature, and especially demanded in his forlorn situation, it used the most insidious arts to circumvent and to crush him. He had no remedy against malice or misapprehension on the part of his accusers, or the witnesses against him, who might be his bitterest enemies, since they were never revealed to nor confronted with the prisoner, nor subjected to a cross-examination, which can best expose error or willful collusion in the evidence. Even the poor forms of justice recognized in this court might be readily dispensed with, as its proceedings were impenetrably shrouded from the public eye by the appalling oath of secrecy imposed on all, whether functionaries, witnesses, or prisoners, who entered within its precints. The last and not the least odious feature of the whole was the connection established between the condemnation of the accused and the interest of his judges; since the confiscations which were the uniform penalties of heresy were not permitted to flow into the royal exchequer until they had first discharged the expenses, whether in the shape of salaries or otherwise, incident to the Holy Office.

"The last scene in this dismal tragedy was the *act of faith* (auto da fé), the most imposing spectacle probably which has been witnessed since the ancient Roman triumph, and which, as

intimated by a Spanish writer, was intended somewhat profanely, to represent the terrors of the Day of Judgment. The proudest grandees of the land, on this occasion, putting on the sable livery of familiars of the Holy Office and bearing aloft its banners, condescended to act as the escort of its ministers, while the ceremony was not unfrequently countenanced by the royal presence. . . . The effect was further heightened by the concourse of ecclesiastics in their sacerdotal robes, and the pompous ceremonial which the Church of Rome knows so well how to display on fitting occasions, and which was intended to consecrate, as it were, this bloody sacrifice by the authority of a religion which has expressly declared that it desires mercy and not sacrifice. Puigblanch, vol. i, chap. 4, says, 'The inquisitors, after the celebration of an *auto da fé* at Gaudaloupe, in 1485, wishing probably to justify those bloody executions in the eyes of the people, who had not yet become familiar with them, solicited a sign from the Virgin (whose shrine in that place is noted all over Spain) in testimony of her approbation of the Holy Office. Their petition was answered by such a profusion of miracles that Dr. Francis Sanctius de la Fuente, who acted as scribe on the occasion, became out of breath, and, after recording sixty, gave up in despair, unable to keep pace with their marvelous rapidity.'

"The most important actors in the scene were the unfortunate convicts, who were now disgorged for the first time from the dungeons of the tribunals. They were clad in coarse woolen garments, styled *san-benitos*, brought close around the neck and descending like a frock down to the knees. These were of a yellow color, embroidered with a scarlet cross, and well garnished with figures of devils and flames of fire, which, typical of the heretic's destiny hereafter, served to make him more odious in the eyes of the superstitious multitude. The greater part of the sufferers were condemned to be *reconciled*, the manifold meanings of which soft phrase has been already explained. Those who were to be *relaxed*, as it was called, were delivered over, as impenitent heretics, to the secular arm

in order to expiate their offense by the most painful of deaths, with the consciousness, still more painful, that they were to leave behind them names branded with infamy and families involved in irretrievable ruin.

"It is remarkable that a scheme so monstrous as that of the Inquisition, presenting the most effectual barrier probably that was ever opposed to the progress of knowledge, should have been revived at the close of the fifteenth century, when the light of civilization was rapidly advancing over every part of Europe. It is more remarkable that it should have occurred in Spain, at this time under a government which had displayed great religious independence on more than one occasion, and which had paid uniform regard to the rights of its subjects, and pursued a generous policy in reference to their intellectual culture. Where, we are tempted to ask, when we behold the persecution of an innocent, industrious people for the crime of adhesion to the faith of their ancestors, where was the charity which led the old Castilian to reverence valor and virtue in an Infidel, though an enemy? Where the chivalrous self-devotion, which led the Aragonese monarch, three centuries before, to give away his life in defense of the persecuted sectaries of Provence? Where the independent spirit which prompted the Castilian nobles, during the very last reign, to reject with scorn the purposed interference of the pope himself in their concerns that they were now reduced to bow their neck to a few frantic priests, the members of an order which, in Spain at least, was quite as conspicuous for ignorance as intolerance? True, indeed, the Castilians and the Aragonese subsequently still more gave such evidence of their aversion to the institution that it can hardly be believed that the clergy would have succeeded in fastening it upon them had they not availed themselves of the popular prejudices against the Jews.

"The sufferings thus heaped upon the heads of these unfortunate people were finally requited in full measure to the nation that inflicted them. The fires of the Inquisition, which were lighted largely for the Jews, were destined event-

ually to consume their oppressors. They were still more deeply avenged in the moral influence of this tribunal, which, eating like a pestilent canker into the heart of the monarchy at the very time when it was exhibiting a most goodly promise, left it, at length, a bare and sapless trunk.

"The number of convicts under the guardianship of Torquemada was greatly swelled by the blunders of the Dominican monks, who acted as qualificators or interpreters of what constituted heresy, and whose ignorance led them frequently to condemn as heterodox propositions actually derived from the Fathers of the Church. The prisoners for life alone became so numerous that it was necessary to assign them their own houses as the places of their incarceration."

Torquemada played a very active part in the persecution and expulsion of the Jews and the Moors from Spain, during which the greatest enormities were committed against those most unfortunate races; but the subject will be detailed somewhat at length in the sketch of Ferdinand and Isabella. He, however, was the prime mover in that nefarious enterprise.

Fearing for his own safety in consequence of outraged human nature at the enormities he had committed, that he might be poisoned, assassinated or otherwise justly dealt with, Torquemada the "confessor of sovereigns" went abroad in his old age and died at Avila in 1498, at the age of seventy-eight. It is greatly to be doubted if a more despicable and abhorrent character ever wore the semblance of man. Were it possible for the hundreds of thousands of the wretched victims whom he had subjected to unutterable torture to confront him after death and visit upon him the weight of their indignation and revenge, what a horrible though merited hell he must have endured!

Diego de Dega, a Dominican friar, the friend of Columbus, the bishop of Seville, Ferdinand's confessor and the preceptor of his son John, succeeded Torquemada in 1499. Under his administration 1,664 were burned alived, 832 in effigy, and 32,456 punished in other ways. An insurrection, however,

in consequence of this extreme cruelty, cut short his time of usefulness and caused his removal in 1506 (Herzog, Real Encke, xviii, 332).

The third inquisitor-general was Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros, whose term in the office continued from 1507 to 1517. In these ten years Llorente computes 2,536 were burned alive, 1,368 burned in effigy, and 27,263 punished in other ways. This number includes those who resided in Aragon (Herzog R. E., vi., 687).

The Spanish Inquisition long exercised its terrible power in Spain and was effectively planted in the Netherlands, Portugal, and even into our own America was it introduced soon after its discovery, where, however, its rule was hardly as terrible as in the old world. The number of thousands of poor unfortunates that were subjected to it in the nearly five hundred years of its terrible rule are almost beyond computation. Victor Hugo, the well known French writer, it is said, has estimated that the victims of the Inquisition amounted to 5,000,000 human beings.

Of all the religions which men have entertained in the past four thousand years, none of them, nor all of them combined, have produced such a wholesale and vast amount of terrorism, unhappiness, persecution, torture of body and mind, bloodshed, carnage, and death, as has the system of Christianity. Its intolerance has been persistent and heartless; its persecutions have been cruel and relentless; its wars have been profuse and bloody; its tyranny over the minds of men has been debasing and deadly; and yet we are solemnly assured that it is God's own scheme, that it is the most merciful and lovely system of religious faith that has ever been devised, and that it has done more to promote the progress and happiness of mankind than all other influence combined. The claim is a false one.

FERDINAND AND ISABELLA.

It is not the purpose in this sketch to detail the entire history of these two remarkable individuals, under whose reign the glory of Spain was greatly augmented, and under whose *régime* also her shame and endless ignominy were secured. It is the object rather to give the work of persecution, torture, expulsion, and death which was pressed against those whom these sovereigns were taught by their spiritual advisers to regard as heretics, unbelievers, enemies to their holy religion, more especially the hapless races of the Moors and the Jews, whose progenitors had for centuries made their homes in Spain.

Ferdinand V. was the son of John II., king of Aragon, and Queen Joan, and was born in 1452. By marriage with Isabella of Castile, the two kingdoms were united. His subsequent conquest of Granada made him sovereign over Spain.

Isabella was the daughter of John II. of Castile, and was born April 22, 1451, at Madrigal. Her father, an imbecile king, after a weak reign of forty-eight years, died when Isabella was four years of age. Her elder brother, Henry, succeeded to the throne. He was an amiable, generous, extravagant, licentious, and rather weak ruler, whose reign was distinguished by numerous raids and forays upon the Moors, which, however, resulted in little save loss of life and property. After an inglorious career, ending with disagreements with the nobles, he was deposed in 1465. This was followed by continued dissensions and civil anarchy among the nobility. Alfonso, a younger brother of Henry, at twelve years of age, was by a faction placed on the throne. It could hardly be called a reign, and after three years he came to a sudden

death, as thought by some, by poison. At this juncture the archbishop of Toledo demanded of Isabella that she accept the crown and permit herself to be declared the queen of Castile; but she persistently refused, saying, so long as her brother Henry lived he had the only right to the crown. The populace were strongly attached to Isabella, and Henry evinced a yielding tendency to allow her to assume command of the nation, and he signed papers acknowledging her the heir to the throne. After several suitors asking for her hand, she bestowed it upon her relative, Ferdinand, feeling that they should thereby bring about the greatest good by uniting the people of Castile and Aragon, speaking one language, and the descendants of a common stock. The articles of marriage were signed by Ferdinand, January 7, 1469, but the marriage did not take place till the nineteenth of the following October.

Isabella was a woman of amiable character, but she had been so educated in the doctrines of the Romish Church that she became an ardent devotee, and the right material for a persecuting bigot. Much of this trait of her character was doubtless due to the teachings and inculcations of Torquemada, who was her confessor, and who extracted from her a promise that if she came to the throne she would give her influence and aid to the extermination of heretics and unbelievers in their religion.

Henry IV., the brother of Isabella, after factions and tumults within his own realm, and warfare with the French under Louis XI., died on December 11, 1474, and on the following morning she was, with her own approbation, proclaimed queen of Castile. Attired in royal robes she was mounted on a Spanish jennet, and escorted in a civic procession through the streets of Segovia. On arriving at the public square she alighted from the palfrey and seated herself upon the throne erected for the occasion, and here Ferdinand and Isabella were declared king and queen of Castile. Ferdinand soon joined her, and they commenced an eventful and remarkable reign. After a somewhat protracted contest with King Alfonso of Portugal, in which the latter was defeated,

and after the death of John II. of Aragon, the realm of the two sovereigns embraced both kingdoms.

Several years were spent by the two sovereigns in civil reforms, quelling disturbances, restoring confidence and trade, and it must be acknowledged that during these years the condition of the country greatly improved; and it was not till the evil day of the establishment of the Inquisition within their realm that real disaster and eternal disgrace dawned upon this regal pair and the fair country over which they held rule. The baneful effects of the religious instruction which they had imbibed in their early years spread desolation and devastation over parts of their beautiful domain, and it is the crushing tyranny of the same system of ecclesiastical rule and mental bondage that has dragged that ancient and flourishing country down to the miserable condition, religiously, politically, and socially, which it now occupies.

That diabolical institution, the modern Inquisition, more frequently called the Spanish Inquisition, was introduced into Spain in 1480. The queen, by the most urgent importunities of cardinals, bishops, and priests, was at length induced to petition pope Sixtus IV., who at that time filled the papal chair, to issue an edict for the introduction of the terrible Inquisition into Spain. In the woman's real nature she was opposed to such cruel measures as the Inquisition entailed, but the confidence she placed in the priesthood overruled the inherent goodness of her heart and caused her to be the patron and protector of the most infernal institution the world has ever known; and herein is strikingly exemplified the pernicious influence of the system of religion whose champions are herein under consideration.

One of the principal reasons given for the introduction of that engine of direst cruelty was for the extermination of the Jews and the Moors who obstinately persisted in adhering to the religion of their fathers and who for centuries had been contributing to the wealth and welfare of their adopted country. Upon this subject Prof. Draper, in his "Conflict between Religion and Science," beginning at page 141, says:

"In the tenth century the Khalif Hakem II. had made beautiful Andalusia, the paradise of the world. Christians, Mussulmen, Jews, mixed together without restraint. There, among many celebrated names, that have descended to our times, was Gerbert, destined subsequently to become pope. There, too, was Peter the Venerable, and many Christian ecclesiastics. Peter says that he found learned men even from Britain pursuing astronomy. All learned men, no matter from what country they came, or what their religious views, were welcomed. The khalif had in his palace a manufactory of books, and copyists, binders, illuminators. He kept book-buyers in all the great cities of Asia and Africa. His library contained four hundred thousand volumes, superbly bound and illuminated.

. . . . . .

"Almansor, who usurped the khalifate to the prejudice of Hakem's son, thought that his usurpation would be sustained if he put himself at the head of the orthodox party. He, therefore, had the library of Hakem searched, and all works of a scientific or philosophical nature carried into the public places and burnt, or thrown into the cisterns of the palace. By a similar court revolution Averroes, in his old age, . . . was expelled from Spain; the religious party had triumphed over the philosophical. He was denounced as a traitor to religion. An opposition to philosophy had been organized all over the Mussulman world. There was hardly a philosopher who was not punished. Some were put to death, and the consequence was that Islam was full of hypocrites.

"Into Italy, Germany, England, Averroism had silently made its way. It found favor in the eyes of the Franciscans, and a focus in the University of Paris. By very many of the leading minds it had been accepted. But at length the Dominicans, the rivals of the Franciscans, sounded an alarm. They said it destroys all personality, conducts to fatalism, and renders inexplicable the difference and progress of individual intelligence. The declaration that there is but one intellect is

an error subversive of the merits of the saints—it is an assertion that there is no difference among men. What! is there no difference between the holy soul of Peter and the damned soul of Judas? Are they identical? Averroes in this, his blasphemous doctrine, denies creation, providence, revelation, the Trinity, the efficacy of prayers, of alms, and of litanies: he disbelieves in the resurrection and immortality; he places the *summum bonum* in mere pleasure.

"So, too, among the Jews, who were then the leading intellects of the world, Averroism had been largely propagated. Their great writer, Maimonides, had thoroughly accepted it; his school was spreading it in all directions. A furious persecution arose on the part of the orthodox Jews. Of Maimonides it had been formerly their delight to declare that he was 'the Eagle of the Doctors, the Great Sage, the Glory of the West, the Light of the East, second only to Moses.' Now they proclaimed that he had abandoned the faith of Abraham: had denied the possibility of creation; believed in the eternity of the world; had given himself up to the manufacture of Atheists; had deprived God of his attributes; made a vacuum of him; had declared him inaccessible to prayer and a stranger to the government of the world. The works of Maimonides were committed to the flames by the synagogues of Montpellier, Barcelona, and Toledo.

"Scarcely had the conquering arms of Ferdinand and Isabella overthrown the Arabian dominion of Spain, when measures were taken by the papacy to extinguish these opinions, which, it was believed, were undermining European Christianity.

. . . . . .

"The Inquisition having already been tried in the south of France, had there proved to be very effective for the suppression of heresy. It had been introduced into Aragon. Now was assigned to it the duty of dealing with the Jews.

"In the old times under Visigothic rule these people had greatly prospered, but the leniency that had been shown to them was succeeded by atrocious persecution, when the Visi-

goths abandoned their Arianism and became orthodox. The most inhuman ordinances were issued against them—a law was enacted condemning them all to be slaves. It was not to be wondered at that, when the Saracen invasion took place, the Jews, did whatever they could to promote its success. They, like the Arabs, were an Oriental people; both traced their lineage to Abraham, their common ancestor; both were believers in the unity of God. It was their defense of that doctrine that had brought upon them the hatred of their Visigothic masters.

"Under the Saracen rule they were treated with the highest consideration. They became distinguished for their wealth and their learning. For the most part they were Aristotelians. They founded many schools and colleges. Their mercantile interests led them to travel all over the world. They particularly studied the science of medicine. Throughout the middle ages they were the physicians and bankers of Europe. Of all men they saw the course of human affairs from the most elevated point of view. Among the special sciences they became proficient in mathematics and astronomy; they composed the tables of Alfonso, and were the cause of the voyage of De Gama. They distinguished themselves in light literature. From the tenth to the fourteenth century their literature was the first in Europe. They were to be found in the courts of princes as physicians, or as treasurers managing the public finances.

"The orthodox clergy in Navarre had excited popular prejudices against them. To escape the persecutions that arose, many of them feigned to turn Christians, and of these many apostatized to their former faith. The papal nuncio at the court of Castile raised a cry for the establishment of the Inquisition. The poorer Jews were accused of sacrificing Christian children at the Passover, in mockery of the crucifixion; the richer were denounced as Averroists. Under the influence of Torquemada, a Dominican monk, the confessor of Queen Isabella, that princess solicited a bull from the pope for the establishment of the Holy Office. A bull was accord-

ingly issued in November, 1478, for the detection and suppression of heresy. In the first year of the operation of the Inquisition, 1481, two thousand victims were burnt in Andalusia; besides these many thousands were dug up from their graves and burnt. Seventeen thousand were fined or imprisoned for life. Whoever of the persecuted race could escape, fled for his life. Torquemada, now appointed inquisitor-general for Castile and Leon, illustrated his office by his ferocity.

"Anonymous accusations were received, the accused was not confronted by witnesses, torture was relied upon for conviction; it was inflicted in vaults where no one could hear the cries of the tormented. . . . Llorente, the historian of the Inquisition, computes that Torquemada and his collaborators, in the course of eighteen years, burnt at the stake, ten thousand two hundred and twenty persons, six thousand eight hundred and sixty in effigy, and otherwise punished ninety-seven thousand three hundred and twenty-one. This frantic priest destroyed Hebrew Bibles wherever he could find them, and burnt six thousand volumes of Oriental literature at Salamanca under an imputation that they inculcated Judaism. With unutterable disgust and indignation, we learn that the papal government realized much money by selling to the rich dispensations to secure them from the Inquisition

"But all these frightful atrocities proved failures. The conversions were few. Torquemada, therefore, insisted on the immediate banishment of every unbaptized Jew. On March 30, 1492, the edict of expulsion was signed. All unbaptized Jews, of whatever age, sex, or condition, were ordered to leave the realm by the end of the following July. If they revisited it they should suffer death. They might sell their effects and take the proceeds in merchandise or bills of exchange, but not in gold or silver. Exiled thus suddenly from the land of their birth, the land of their ancestors for hundreds of years, they could not in the glutted market that arose sell what they possessed. Nobody would purchase what could be got for nothing after July. The

Spanish clergy occupied themselves by preaching on the public squares sermons filled with denunciations against their victims, who, when the time for expatriation came, swarmed in the roads and filled the air with their cries of despair. Even the Spanish onlookers wept at the scene of agony. Torquemada, however, enforced the ordinance that no one should afford them any help.

"Of the banished persons, some made their way into Africa, some into Italy; the latter carried with them to Naples ship-fever, which destroyed not fewer than twenty thousand in that city and devastated that peninsula; some reached Turkey; a few England. Thousands, especially mothers with nursing children, infants, and old people, died on the way, many of them in the agonies of thirst.

"This action against the Jews was soon followed by one against the Moors. A pragmatica was issued at Seville, February, 1502, setting forth the obligations of the Castilians to drive the enemies of God from the land, and ordering that all unbaptized Moors in the kingdoms of Castile and Leon above the age of infancy should leave the country by the end of April. They might sell their property, but not take away any gold or silver; they were forbidden to emigrate to the Mohammedan dominions; the penalty of disobedience was death. Their condition was thus worse than that of the Jews, who had been permitted to go where they chose. Such was the fiendish intolerance of the Spaniards, that they asserted the government would be justified in taking the lives of all the Moors for their shameless infidelity.

"What an ungrateful return for the toleration that the Moors in their day of power had given to the Christians! No faith was kept with the victims. Granada had surrendered under the solemn guarantee of the full enjoyment of civil and religious liberty. At the instigation of Cardinal Ximenes that pledge was broken, and, after a residence of eight centuries, the Mohammedans were driven out of the land."

In speaking of the effects of the terrible system of persecution so mercilessly enforced by the Inquisition and the relent-

less persecutions in connection, Prescott (History of Ferdinand and Isabella. vol. 2, page 450) writes as follows:

"From that disastrous hour, religion wore a new aspect in this unhappy country. The spirit of intolerance, no longer hooded in the darkness of the cloister, now stalked abroad in all its terrors. Zeal was exalted into fanaticism, and a rational spirit of proselytism into one of fiendish persecution. It was not enough now, as formerly, to conform passively to the doctrines of the Church, but it was enjoined to make war on all who refused them. The natural feelings of compunction in the discharge of this sad duty was a crime; and the tear of sympathy, wrung out by the sight of mortal agonies, was an offense to be expiated by humiliating penance. The most frightful maxims were deliberately engrafted into the code of morals. Any one, it was said, might conscientiously kill an apostate wherever he could meet him. There was some doubt whether a man might slay his own father, if a heretic or Infidel, but none whatever as to his right, in that event to take away the life of his son or of his brother. These maxims were not a dead letter, but in the most active operation, as the sad records of the dread tribunal too well prove. The character of the nation underwent a melancholy change. The milk of charity, nay of human feeling, was soured in every bosom. The liberality of the old Spanish cavalier gave way to the fiery fanaticism of the monk. The taste for blood, once gratified, begat a cannibal appetite in the people, who, cheered on by the frantic clergy, seemed to vie with one another in the eagerness with which they ran down the miserable game of the Inquisition."

It will not of course be lost sight of that it was under the patronage of Ferdinand and Isabella, especially the latter, that Columbus, the Genoese sailor, was enabled to make his voyage of discovery to the Western Hemisphere and bring to the knowledge of Europe the existence of an unknown world. True, his patience in waiting upon the queen's decision was exhausted upon several occasions. In extreme poverty he made his way to the Spanish court for aid to carry out his

long cherished enterprise. After many wearisome days he arrived at court when "his suit was referred to a council at Salamanca before whom, however, his doctrines were confuted from the five books of Moses, the Psalms, the Prophecies, the Gospels, the Epistles, and the writings of the Fathers—St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Gregory, St. Basil, St. Ambrose. Morover they were demonstrably inconsistent with reason; since, if even he should depart from Spain, the rotundity of the earth would present a kind of mountain, up which it was impossible for him to sail even with the fairest wind, and so he could never get back. The grand cardinal of Spain had also indicated their irreligious nature, and Columbus began to fear that instead of receiving aid as a discoverer, he should fall into trouble as a heretic. However, after many years of mortification and procrastination, he at length prevailed with Queen Isabella; and on April 17, 1492, in the field before Granada, then just wrenched from the Mohammedans by the arms of Ferdinand and Isabella, he received his commission. With a nobleness of purpose, he desired no reward unless he should succeed; but in that case stipulated that he should have the title of Admiral and Viceroy, and that his perquisite should be one-tenth of all he discovered—conditions which show what manner of man this great sailor was. He had bound himself to contribute one-eighth to the expenses of the expedition; this he accomplished through the Pinzons of Palos, and old an wealthy seafaring family. These arrangements once ratified he lost not a moment in completing the preparations for his expedition. The royal authority enabled him to take—forcibly, if necessary—both ships and men. But, even with that advantage, he would hardly have succeeded if the Pinzons had not joined heartily with him, personally sharing in the dangers of the voyage" (Intellectual Development of Europe, p. 443).

It is said that one of the arguments used by one of the queen's spiritual advisers, which perhaps decided her to yield to the importunities of Columbus and afford him aid to prosecute his darling enterprise was, that should new lands be

discovered the inhabitants would not only be the subjects of the queen, but they would also become converts to the Christian religion, and those who would not become converts could be punished as heretics were punished within her own domains. To show how well the suggestions of this holy man were carried out, it is only necessary to state that, under the teachings of the Spanish missionaries sent out after America was discovered, more than fifteen millions of the inhabitants of the New World were mercilessly put to death in spreading the religion of the reputed lamb-like Son of God.

The bloody and merciless wars prosecuted for a term of years by Ferdinand and Isabella against Granada and the Moors will not be dwelt on here. Suffice it to say, they were cruel in the extreme and caused the most intense suffering and upon the widest scale. The intense hatred engendered by this system of Christianity towards every creed that dissented from it was manifest through it all. The native goodness of heart which was Isabella's by nature was, by the influence of her religion and the instructions of her religious teachers, turned into the bitterest gall and hatred. By nature she was an angel, but her religion converted her almost into a demon.

Isabella died in 1505, and Ferdinand in 1516. With all their abilities and all their good qualities, doubtless there would have been far less suffering and unhappiness in the world had they never lived. And had they been the devotees of some other system of religion than the Christian, the number of deaths they caused and the amount of human happiness they destroyed would have been far less.

ALEXANDER VI.

THE fifteenth century was drawing to a close. The ashes of Wickliffe had been scattered to the winds; John Huss and Jerome of Prague had perished at Constance, and the Church was again united. It was the halcyon day of Christendom. The papacy had reached its apogee of prosperity and power, perfidy and pollution, and the fierce fires of the Inquisition lit the world from the Grampian hills to the banks of the Ganges. The Church gloried in cruelty and corruption. In Rome, gold was God, murder and debauchery were religion.

The readers of these pages who have thus far perused the accounts of the prodigies of vice who have filled the papal chair have doubtless imagined that they have already passed the climax of human wickedness. Well would it be for the Church could it close its annals here. But another man is to occupy the apostolic throne, whose hideous crimes have made the heart of humanity to shudder; aye, even a Borgia is to sit in St. Peter's chair as the crowned and annointed head of the Church, the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. The very lowest step in the downward progress of pontifical impurity is reached, the utmost limits of human depravity attained. Says the historian, Dean Waddingdon:

"The ecclesiastical records of fifteen centuries contain no name so loathsome, no crime so foul as his; and while the voice of every impartial writer is loud in his execration, he is, in one respect, singularly consigned to infamy, since not one among the zealous annalists of the Roman Church has breathed a whisper in his praise. Thus, those who have pursued him with the most unqualified vituperations are thought to have described him most faithfully; and the mention of

his character has excited a sort of rivalry in the expression of indignation and hatred."

Rodrigo Borgia was the descendant, on his mother's side, of the Spanish family of Borgia. This infamous family had already occupied the pontifical throne in the person of Calixtus III. Rodrigo was the offspring of an incestuous intercourse between the pope and his sister Joanna, whose husband was a certain Godfrey of Valencia. Wishing to bequeath his name to his son, his holiness obliged his brother-in-law to abandon his own name and take that of Borgia.

Roderigo was the subject of the most assiduous care from his earliest infancy. His education was confided to the charge of the most accomplished masters of the age. They fitted him for the profession of an advocate. But he was a Borgia, and consequently bad from birth. There was no period of his life when he was not an opponent of everything good. As an advocate, he only employed his splendid talents in defending the most immoral and scandalous causes. His profession imposed a certain restriction on his conduct. It therefore became insupportable to him. He determined to choose a career in which he could utterly abandon himself to his natural predeliction for debauchery and crime. So he adopted the profession of arms, and was made an officer of a free company.

Among his liaisons at this time was one with a beautiful Spanish widow and her two daughters. He succeeded in seducing the mother and initiating the children into his beastly debaucheries. Upon the death of the mother, he placed the eldest of the daughters in a convent, and retained as his mistress the youngest and handsomest, named Rosa Vanozza. By her he had five children, Francis, Cæsar, Lucretia, Godfrey, and one who died when young.

His unparalleled vices became the scandal of Spain, where he continued his career of crime for seven years. Then his uncle Calixtus became pope. Rodrigo saw at once the immense fortune which this event promised him. The affectionate nephew at once forwarded his congratulations to his

holiness. Calixtus invited him to Rome and put him in possession of a post in the government of the Church which brought him in an annual revenue of twelve thousand crowns. This sum, joined to an annual revenue of thirty thousand ducats, which he derived from the property of the family, enabled him to maintain the establishment of a prince. He hastened to obey his uncle's call. Wishing to conceal his course of life in Spain in the new part he was about to play, he left Vanozza and the children at Venice, where he hoped to visit them without exciting suspicion. A magnificent palace was set apart for him in Rome, and he became the favorite of the holy Father. He put on a mask of hypocrisy which imposed on the people. He even acquired a reputation for morality and great sanctity. His eloquence captivated the minds of the multitude, and he became the master of the pontiff himself. He was appointed archbishop of Valencia, vice-chancellor of the Church, and cardinal-deacon of St. Nicholas. These appointments gave him a pension of twenty-eight thousand crowns of gold. This rendered him one of the richest men in Rome.

And now the notorious debauchee, the associate of robbers and assassins, the pillaging soldier and incestuous lover of Rosa Vanozza, put on the garb of piety and lived the life of a veritable anchorite. Whenever he appeared in public his hands were crossed on his breast and his eyes were bent to the ground. He visited hospitals and churches, scattered his abundant alms among the poor, and gave out that at his death his great wealth would be the legacy of the unfortunate. His hypocritical contempt for the affairs of this world and his affected love for morality and religion completely won the hearts of the Romans. They came to regard him a Solomon for wisdom, a Job for patience, and a Moses for meekness and the publication of the law of God. He was indefatigable in the discharge of the duties of his office. He became the most popular person in the meetings at the Vatican, and the favorite of the court of Rome.

Never did man know better than he how to hide his pas-

sions and plans under a mask. Whilst he was playing this farce at Rome he was carrying on a correspondence with Vanozza, who remained at Venice. The following is extracted from one of these letters which have come down to us:

"Rosa, my well beloved, imitate my example; remain chaste until it shall become in my power to re-seek thee, and mingle our love in infinite pleasures. Let no other mouth profane thy charms, no other hand raise those veils which conceal my sovereign good; a little more patience, and he who is called my uncle will bequeath me the chair of St. Peter as a heritage. In the meantime take great pains with the education of our children, for they are destined to govern people and kings."

But he was doomed to disappointment. The very rigidity of morals which he assumed prevented the suffrages being given him upon the death of Calixtus. The tiara was given to Pius II., during whose pontificate Rodrigo exercised no influence over the government of the Church. He seized on the fortune his uncle left him, and solely devoted himself to increasing his immense wealth.

Pius died; Paul II. succeeded him, and then Sixtus IV. During the pontificate of the latter, Rodrigo bought the rich abbey of Subiaco, and the legation of Aragon and Castile. But he could no longer endure the constraint of his new life. He returned to Spain, put himself at the head of a band of adventurers, and committed so many murders and rapes that the king drove him out of his dominions.

Again he came to Rome. He now made up his mind to live no longer in concealment. He brought with him his mistress and five children. He set apart for them a palace in a retired quarter of the city. Here Vanozza took the title of the Countess Ferdinand of Castile, from the name of Rodrigo's intendant who passed as her husband. Under the pretext of visiting his countryman, Rodrigo went every night to the residence of his mistress. It is said that he there passed whole nights in his orgies with Vanozza, and, eternal shame, with his own daughter Lucretia.

Popes died and others succeeded, but Rodrigo Borgia continued his infamous life. His gross debaucheries were scarcely noticed in the midst of the saturnalia of the papal court. The holy city had become an immense brothel, in which were fifty thousand prostitutes. Cut-throats and assassins lurked in every street, and every road was infested by bands of banditti.

Immediately on the death of Innocent VIII., on July 25, 1491, the cardinals assembled to elect his successor. They had been obliged to protect their sumptuous palaces during their absence from prowling bands of pillagers by planting cannon in the avenues and leaving guards of soldiers. The conclave were obliged to close the approaches to the Vatican with barricades of enormous beams, and defend it with strong forces of horse and foot. After having thus secured their safety they proceeded to the election of a pope.

Borgia had already secured the suffrages of the majority of the cardinals. To some he gave palaces, to others castles, lands, and money. The cardinal Orsino sold his vote for the castles of Monticelli and Sariani; the cardinal of Colonna demanded for his vote the rich abbey of St. Benedict, as well as the domains and the right of patronage for himself and family forever; the cardinal of St. Angelo claimed the bishopric of Porto, and the tower which was a dependency on it, with a cellar full of wine. The cardinal of Parma received the city of Nepi; Savelli received the government of Citta Castellana, and of the church of St. Mary the Greater; a monk of Venice, who had obtained the cardinalate, sold his vote for five thousand ducats of gold and the promise of passing a night with Lucretia, the daughter of Rodrigo. Four mules, laden with silver, were publicly driven into the palace of Sforza, the most influential of the cardinals. Having succeeded in buying up the sacred college, he was proclaimed pope by the name of Alexander VI.

And so at last Rodrigo Borgia was pope, the vicar of Christ on earth. He made such haste to clothe himself in the pontifical ornaments, and seized the tiara with so much eagerness,

that the cardinal Medicis remarked to Lorenzo: "I fear, my brother, that we are surrendered to the most voracious wolf in the world; and he will doubtless devour us, if we do not hinder it by prompt fight." Pope Alexander entered his palace in triumph. All along his route the streets were strewn with flowers and hung with rich tapestry, while the acclamations of the populace rent the air. Solemn embassies came to offer him congratulations from the different courts of Europe, and Christendom rejoiced at his elevation to the holy see. Rodrigo Borgia now realized the dream of his ambition. He was now the crowned and anointed head of the Christian Church. He now cast aside his mask, and no longer placed any restraint upon his passions. All laws, human and divine, were now trampled under foot, and the veil was shamelessly stripped aside which had hitherto hidden his monstrous licentiousness. His mistress, his daughter Lucretia, and his other children, were installed in the Vatican. He had now nothing to fear. He had been proclaimed father of the faithful, king of kings, and the vicegerent of God on earth.

As soon as he was seated on the apostolic throne he loaded his bastards with wealth and honors and turned Rome into a slaughter-house. He made his eldest son Francis duke of Candia and prince of Beneventum; Cæsar, his second son, who was, next to Lucretia, the object of his most tender care, was made a cardinal and archbishop of Valencia, in Spain.

He negotiated a marriage between his bastard son Godfrey and Donna Dancha, daughter of the king of Naples. The king contracted to bestow the principality of Squillace and the countship of Cariati on the young couple, to make a rich gift in benefices to Cæsar, a pension of five thousand ducats to Francis, duke of Candia, with one of the first posts in the kingdom and the command of his armies, besides the payment of ten thousand ducats to supply the needs of the holy Father himself.

Rome was given up to public feasts and rejoicings on account of this marriage. Such was the display of Alexander's magnificence upon this occasion that the treasury of the

Church was emptied. He then had recourse to the expedients usually employed by the popes of that period to re-fill their coffers, viz., an increase of imposts, and the publication of a crusade against the Turks. And although the people had been robbed for forty years, under pretense of wars against the Turks which never took place, they still brought enormous sums to the Vatican for this purpose, which were lavished in the licentious orgies of the bastards of Alexander and the infamous Lucretia.

The treasury was again replenished from the profits of the crusade. Pope Alexander then proceeded to conclude a marriage between his daughter and John Sforza. Says Stephen Infessura: "At this marriage took place fêtes and orgies worthy of Madame Lucretia. In the evening his holiness, the Cardinal Borgia, the duke of Candia, some courtiers, and several noble ladies supped together, at which play-actors and female dancers appeared, who represented obscene plays, to the great joy of the guests." (The recital of the after transactions are not proper to be given in this place.) Alexander had assented to this marriage of Lucretia because he had conceived a new passion for the beautiful sister of Alexander Farnese. This wretch had prostituted to the pope his beautiful young sister, Wilhelmina, as the purchase price of pardon for a crime he had committed. Farnese finally obtained a cardinal's hat, and in course of time filled the papal chair under the name of Paul III.

Lucretia refused to accompany her noble husband to his principality, but persisted in remaining in the palace of the Vatican. Burchard, the master of ceremonies at the pontifical court, who carefully noted, hour by hour, all that occurred, says: "She no longer quitted the apartments of the holy Father, by day or by night." She obtained complete control over Alexander. All her requests were granted, and she soon secured the superintendence of the government of the Church. No letter was opened except in her presence, no business was despatched except under her direction. The sacred college was convoked by her. She would often, at the

close of an orgy, preside over the council of cardinals with naked bosom and in the scanty costume of a bacchante. In this shameless state she was accustomed to give and receive the most immodest embraces while the deliberations of the council turned rather on subjects of licentiousness than on ecclesiastical affairs. Even Burchard himself, habituated as he was to such things, cannot refrain from exclaiming, while recording them, "Horror! ignominy! disgrace!"

Bajaset was the Ottoman emperor at this time. Mussulman embassadors came from him to the court of Rome. The following extracts from the letter of the emperor will explain the business he had with his holiness, Alexander VI.: "The Sultan Bajaset, by the grace of God, the greatest king and caliph of the two continents of Asia and Europe, to the excellent lord, Alexander, *father of all Christians*, by the gifts of Providence, and most worthy pontiff of the Roman Church, reverence, kindness, and sincerity.

. . . . . .

"I pledge myself to give you three hundred thousand ducats, several cities, and the *shirt* of *Jesus Christ*, if your *holiness will remove Zizim from the world in any way you may judge best.* A signal service will thus be rendered to the prisoner himself, and you, most illustrious lord, will not commit a crime, since, by *your religion, Christians are ordered to exterminate heretics and Infidels.*" Only an overture to the head of the Christian Church, in the name of religion, for the poisoning of an Eastern prince. The stipulated consideration for the job was a certain number of ducats and cities, and the *shirt* of *Jesus Christ.* Comines affirms that the offer of the sultan was accepted, and the statement is substantiated by the discovery of a secret treaty between the courts of Constantinople and Rome which fully sets forth the engagement on the part of Bajaset. It was at this time that an important event occurred—the discovery of America by that wonderful man, Christopher Columbus.

It had long been an established doctrine that the pope possessed the privilege of giving all heathen countries to such

Catholic princes as brought them under the jurisdiction of the Church. This doctrine had been recognized early in the century by Martin V., who ceded to the crown of Portugal all the lands it might discover from Cape Bojador in Africa to the Indies. Ferdinand and Isabella were sovereigns of Spain. Upon being apprised of the success of Columbus, they took measures to obtain the sanction of the pope. Spanish embassadors were sent to Rome. Alexander VI. issued a bull dated May 2, 1493, "ceding to the Spanish sovereigns the same rights, privileges, and indulgences, in respect to the newly discovered regions, as had been accorded to the Portuguese with regard to their African discoveries, under the same condition of planting and propagating the Catholic faith. To prevent any conflicting claims, however, between the two powers, in the wide range of their discoveries, another bull was issued on the following day, containing the famous line of demarcation, by which their territories were thought to be clearly and permanently defined. This was an ideal line drawn from the north to the south pole, a hundred leagues to the west of the Azores and the Cape de Verd Islands. All land discovered by the Spanish navigators to the west of this line, and which had not been taken possession of by any Christian power before the preceding Christmas, was to belong to the Spanish crown; all land discovered in the contrary direction was to belong to Portugal. It seems never to have occurred to the pontiff that by pushing their opposite careers of discovery, they might some day or other come again in collision, and renew the question of territorial right at the antipodes" (Washington Irving's "Life and Voyages of Columbus," book v, ch. 8). Thus, by a single dash of the pope's pen, the whole of North and South America were handed over, like an apple or an orange, as a present from his holiness to the Christian majesties of Portugal and Spain. The only return asked by Alexander for thus disposing of three-fourths of the human race was the payment of a large sum of money, and a pledge on the part of the Portuguese and Spaniards to convert the natives to

Christianity. In fulfillment of this engagement with the pope, the missionaries of Spain, within sixty years after the publication of the bull, murdered fifteen millions of victims in the New World.

Italy soon became the theatre of war. Its old political systems were on the eve of dissolution. Ludovico, the Moorish duke of Milan, to establish his newly acquired power, had tendered to Charles VIII. of France the tempting bait of the kingdom of Naples. Alexander's son had married the illegitimate daughter of the king of Naples. Motives of family aggrandizement moved Alexander to refuse the demand of the French envoys for the investiture of Naples. Appeals were made to the French king by Alexander's enemies to march upon Rome, convoke a council, and purge Christendom of the infamous pope.

In the autumn of 1494 Charles VIII. crossed the Alps. City after city fell before him, and before the close of the year Rome was added to the number. Alexander took refuge in the castle of San Angelo. He hourly expected to be ejected from the chair of St. Peter. But having gained Charles' minister, Briconnet, by the bribe of a cardinal's hat, the way was opened for terms of negotiation between the king and pontiff. The reconciliation was officially celebrated on the sixteenth of January, 1495, and they rode side and side through the city. The French retreated, and the king of Naples reëntered his capital.

At this time the state of Rome was such as can neither be described nor thought of. The holy city seemed the sole spot where all the cess-pools of iniquity met and overflowed. The most impure groves of ancient worship saw not the like of the dissoluteness that prevailed at the pontiff's seat. Poison and the dagger ruled at Rome. Nightly assassinations took place in its public streets. The Vatican was the scene of festivities which were enlivened by farces and indecent songs. The historian, Infessura, says: "Most of the ecclesiastics had their mistresses, and all the convents of the capital were houses of ill fame."

The second son of Alexander, Cæsar, stands in history as the hero of crime. He was made a cardinal at the age of eighteen, unblushing perjury being employed to conceal his illegitimate birth. All Rome trembled before him. The pope looked on helplessly at the Frankenstein of his own creation. "He loves and hugely fears his son," reports one of the chroniclers of the day. He goes on to relate how Cæsar pursued his father's favorite secretary to his arms, and there butchered him, the pope's robe being saturated with the gushing blood. Alexander conferred upon his eldest son the principality of Beneventum. The prince suddenly disappeared. That night a fagot dealer on the banks of the Tiber saw some person throw a corpse into the river. It was found to be the prince's body. His brother Cæsar had been the instigator of the murder. Ranke is the authority for this fact.

A brother stood in the way of Cæsar's ambition. One day Cæsar caused him to be stabbed on the staircase of the pope's palace, and he was carried, covered with blood, to his own apartments. His wife and sister never left him. They prepared his meals with their own hands lest Cæsar should employ poison. The pope placed guards before his door. Cæsar only remarked, "What cannot be done at dinner may be done at supper." One day he worked his way into the chamber of the wounded man, turned out his wife and sister, and had his executioner strangle his victim before his eyes.

The worst times of the empire seemed returned. This terror of Rome is represented as having been one of the handsomest and most powerful men of his age. His tastes were those of a Spaniard. He revived the amusements of the amphitheatre, where he dispatched six wild bulls successively, severing the head of one from the shoulders at a single stroke. His career of crime was sufficient to give the name of Borgia a sinister celebrity.

Again the treasury of the Vatican needed repairing. Alexander and Cæsar proceeded to refill it. As financiers the Borgias exhibited a peculiar genius. Upon this occasion they resorted to a new method. They made the members of

the sacred college heirs of the holy see. They then sold the cardinal's hats to the highest bidders, and poisoned them to become their heirs. They also carried on an immense trade in crucifixes, relics, and indulgences, the sale of which brought them abundance of funds. Ecclesiastical dignities, employments, and benefices were put up for sale like articles of merchandise, and poison or the dagger never failed to create the needed number of vacancies.

Having amassed immense wealth as Alexander's minister in these financial schemes, the cardinal of Modena, in his turn, became a victim of his coveted fortune. He was poisoned by Cæsar Borgia. The pope and his son were fond of hunting excursions. In giving an account of one of these, in which the papal party was accompanied by a large number of jugglers, prostitutes, and so forth, as well as by five hundred horse and six hundred foot soldiers, Tomasso Thomasi says: "They passed four whole days in the woods of Ostia, taking pleasure in surpassing in debauchery and licentiousness all that the most depraved imagination could invent, after which they returned to that Rome which they had rendered a cavern of brigands, a sanctuary of iniquity. It would be impossible," adds this historian, "to relate all the murders, rapes, and incests which were daily committed at the court of the pope, and scarcely would the life of man be long enough to allow him to transcribe the names of the victims who were stabbed, poisoned, or cast alive into the Tiber. And yet cardinals and princes prostrated themselves before this pope, and applauded his incests with his children. A concert of flattery and praise greeted Cæsar Borgia when he appeared in the consistory.

Avarice and cruelty were domiciled in the Vatican, and a boundless terror seized all who did not desire to have their lives cut short by the cup or the dagger. Burchard relates this of Cæsar Borgia: "It was so great a pleasure for him to see blood flow, that, following the example of the Emperor Commodus, he exercised himself with killing in order to keep up his tiger rage. One day he enclosed the square of

St. Peter with palisades, and ordered his guards to bring into the enclosure prisoners of war, men, women, and children. He then commenced a horrid contest with these unfortunate persons, they bound with cords, he armed at all points, mounted on a fierce courser. He shot some, hacked others with blows of his sabre, trampled some under his horse's feet, and in less than half an hour he caracoled alone in a sea of blood, and in the midst of dead bodies, whilst his holiness and Madame Lucretia were taking their pastime in a balcony, by assisting at this horrid scene." Some of the details given by the master of ceremonies are too frightful and monstrous to have a place in these pages.

Cæsar desired to marry Charlotte, daughter of Frederic, king of Naples. Frederic was a near relative of Ferdinand of Spain; therefore it was of the utmost importance that he avoid offending that monarch. Ferdinand had some pretentions on the kingdom of Portugal. Now, the heiress of the crown of Portugal was in a convent; but an alliance having been contracted between her and a son of the foolish king John, a dispensation for that purpose was procured from the pope. This seriously compromised the interests of Ferdinand. Fearing that the Spanish sovereign would oppose his plan in order to avenge the action of his father, Cæsar determined to cast the blame of the transaction on another. Alexander assembled the consistory, and, in the presence of the Spanish embassador, accused the secretary of the briefs, Florida, archbishop of Cosenza, with having traitorously forged a dispensation for the heiress of Portugal, and with having sent it to her at her entreaty. He ordered his guards to arrest him, and proceeded at once to his examination.

The poor prelate protested his innocence, and was proceeding to tell the whole truth relative to the exact orders he had received, when the pope gave a signal for four sbirri to set upon him. Florida was bound and dragged away to the castle of San Angelo. He was thrown into a dismal dungeon, despoiled of his clothing, and left with a wooden crucifix, a breviary, a bible,two pounds of bread, and a small supply of

water. After enduring this imprisonment for two months, Cæsar approached him with a proposition to take upon himself the fault for which the pope was guilty, and menancing him, in case of refusal, with life-long punishment. In case he consented to sign a declaration that he alone had given to the princes of Portugal the dispensation of marriage, he was promised, not only his freedom, but the favor of the holy Father and his son. Of course the broken-down archbishop publicly confessed his guilt, and signed the paper that the pope caused to be presented to him. Having got possession of the proof, the pope, in violation of his most sacred pledge, proceeded against Florida for forgery. He was pronounced guilty and his person handed over to the civil authorities. Cæsar had promised the archbishop his protection. *He* kept his word. He protected him from the rack by poisoning him. Then he and Alexander sold at auction the property and benefices of the murdered man.

Europe at last rose in indignation against the infamous pope. Embassadors came from the sovereigns to summon him in full consistory to put an end to his career of crime if he did not wish to be condemned by a general council, and deposed from the holy see. The embassadors of the emperor of Germany, the kings of France, England, Castile, and Portugal, took advantage of a day of solemn audience to present the wishes of their masters to the pope. Alexander became furious. He caused his guards to enter the hall, and threatened to throw them out of the window. The following is a specimen of his violent declamation: "It is a pretty thing for these despots to reproach me with my elevation to the chair of St. Peter, and impute to me as a crime some robberies and assassinations—they who leave kingdoms to their children as farms are bequeathed, and who murder millions of men in their quarrels! Go, ye footmen; return to them who sent you, and say to them that I have yet much to do before I can equal them in wickedness."

"What should people think of their tyrants if an Alexander VI. judges kings to be more infamous than himself,"

remarked Jerome Savonarola. These bold words lost the life of him who uttered them. This man was the prior of the convent of St. Mark, in Florence. He dared to denounce the crimes of the court at Rome, and to herald the era of reform. He was the Luther of Italy. The purity of his morals, the elevation of his soul, and his unexampled eloquence made him the leader of a host of followers who resolved to make Florence once more a republic, to destroy the papacy, to curb the tyranny of the great, and to arouse in the heart of decaying and licentious Italy the higher impulses of an uncorrupted faith.

But the vice-god, Alexander VI., could not tolerate such a man on earth. He took steps to destroy him. He caused a mob to seize Savonarola and drag him before the grand inquisitor. He was charged with sorcery, and put to the ordinary and extraordinary torture. His great soul was enclosed in a feeble and sickly body; and as he could not resist the terrible pains of torture, he signed all his tormentors presented to him. But soon as taken down from the rack, he retracted all the avowals which had been wrenched from him by torture. And so seven times did he pass through the hands of his cruel executioners, making avowals during the punishment and retractions soon as reaching his prison. To end it, he was condemned to be burned alive. On the twenty-third of May, 1498, the sentence was executed, and the ashes of Jerome Savonarola were cast into the Arno. Such was the fate of this glorious apostle of liberty, who died a victim of his love for man, and the fair river of Florence will be forever eloquent with the fate of the greatest genius that, perhaps, laid the foundation of European reform.

Whilst this terrible *auto da fé* was taking place at Florence, Alexander was celebrating at Rome, by the usual revolting orgies, the baptism of a new bastard which the beautiful Wilhelmina had borne him. Upon this occasion his holiness placed on the high altars of the church chosen for the ceremony a magnificent portrait of Rosa Vanossa for the adoration of the devout instead of that of the Virgin.

The daughter of Frederic was now at the court of France, and Cæsar went thither for the purpose of obtaining her hand. His train surpassed in magnificence all that had been known before, say the memoirs of the times. All his pages were clothed in tunics of gold and silk, their shoes were covered with fine pearls, their housings glittered with precious stones, and from their necks hung collars of emeralds and sapphires, marvels of workmanship. On his entrance into Paris, Cæsar caused shoes of gold to be placed on his mules so carelessly that at every step they fell from them. But he was not successful with the haughty princess. She declared she would never espouse the bastard of a priest.

Cæsar returned to Italy, and commenced a war of vengeance against the petty princess of Romagna. The city of Faenza was defended by Asbore Manfredi, a youth of sixteen, and of remarkable beauty. The place surrendered on condition that the life and property of this young prince should be preserved. But the obligation of an oath to a Borgia has already been observed. Soon as Cæsar became master of the city he changed the garrison and took possession of the principality. The beauty of the young Manfredi excited his lubricity, and he made him his minion for the gratification of his unnatural passion. After becoming tired of him, he sent him to the holy Father, with his natural brother and another child, who were all three used for the debauchery of the pontiff, and then thrown into the Tiber.

Cæsar wished to foment a war between the new king of France, Louis XII., and the kingdom of Naples. But the husband of Lucretia was an obstacle to his plans. The Borgias were never embarrassed about ridding themselves of a friend or foe who stood in their way. It was arranged that the holy Father should persuade the prince to come to Rome at the festival of the jubilee, and that he should be murdered in the Vatican. He came; and on the evening of his arrival, at the moment when he was entering the palace of the pope alone, he was set upon by assassins who struck him with five blows of their daggers. He was not slain, and had still

strength enough left to drag himself into the interior of the apartments and call for aid. Alexander hastened to the wounded man, and accorded to him all the care which his condition demanded. "The physicians," says Burchard, "who received all the lamentations of the pope as serious, took so much care with the wounded man that they saved his life; and Alphonso was now convalescing, when one night masked men entered his palace and strangled him."

The pope and his son steadily pursued their projects for the subjugation of Italy. Implacable in their policy, forming alliances with the powerful for the annihilation of the weak, and ridding themselves of all their enemies by poison or the sword, it seemed as if all Europe must in time come under their abominable sway. Cæsar reduced the chief cities of Italy by force of arms. All the lords whose spoils he coveted were strangled, together with their children. He spared neither age nor beauty. The favor he granted to young women was to use them in his debauches for a few days and then throw them into the Tiber. This wretch seems to have acquired a species of fascination over princes which prompted them to place their fortunes and lives at his command. .

The third marriage of Lucretia was consummated with Alphonso of Este. In the orgies which followed, licentiousness was carried to its utmost limits. Says Burchard: "This union was celebrated by saturnalia which had never yet been equaled. His holiness supped with his cardinals and the great dignitaries of his court, each having by his side two courtesans, who had no other dress than muslin robes and garlands of flowers. When the repast was over, the courtesans, to the number of fifty, performed lascivious dances, at first alone, then with the cardinals, finally at a signal from Madame Lucretia, their robes fell off, and the dances continued amid great applause from the holy Father." The remaining proceedings will not bear being given in this place. .

And now more money must be raised for the coronation of Cæsar. The apostolical treasury was exhausted, and neither resources nor credit were at hand to replenish it. Cæsar

proposed to the pope an easy, and as it would appear, not very unusual method of supplying their wants. The property of cardinals, on their decease, devolved to the holy see. Corneto was reputed to be one of the wealthiest of the cardinals. Cæsar proposed to put this Corneto out of the way. Alexander assented. He invited the cardinals to an entertainment which he prepared for them in the villa of Corneto, which was near the Vatican. Among the wines sent for this occasion was one bottle prepared with poison. Instructions were carefully given to the superintendent of the feast respecting the disposal of that bottle. It happened that some little time before supper, the pope and his son arrived, and as it was very hot, they called for wine. And then, whether through the error or the absence of the confidential officer, the poisoned bottle was presented to them. Both drank of it, and both suffered its violent effects. Cæsar had mixed water with his wine, and being young and vigorous, was saved by the use of powerful antidotes. But Alexander being enfeebled by age, and having taken his draught nearly pure, died in the course of the same evening. This event took place on the eighteenth of August, 1503. Alexander was seventy-two years old, and had been pope eleven years.

Cries of gladness rang through Rome when the death of the pontiff became known. His dead body was placed in the church of St. Peter, which was soon invaded by an innumerable crowd. Every one wished to see the corpse of him who for eleven years had been the terror of Christendom. Says Raphael Valatenan: "The sight of that dead body, black, deformed, prodigiously swollen, and exhaling an infectious odor, was a disgusting spectacle; black froth covered his lips and nostrils; his mouth was unnaturally open, and his tongue, swollen by the poison, hung down upon his chin. Thus there was not found any devotee or fanatic to kiss his feet or hands, as was the custom." Such was the infection in the church that at six o'clock it was necessary to bury the body. No priest, officer, or cardinal attended the burial ceremony. Carpenters placed his corpse in a coffin, which was

too short, and into which they forced it by pressing in the feet and striking it with a hammer. It was deposited in a tomb at the left of the high altar. And thus terminated the reign of the last pope of the fifteenth century.

The authorities consulted for the above collection of facts are Alexander Gordon, Waddington, D'Aubigné, Dowling, De Cormenin, and the historian Burchard, who was master of ceremonies of Alexander, and who entered in his journal, hour by hour, the occurrences at the Roman court. They are stubborn facts, well substantiated by the most rigorous rendering of history. The most zealous Catholic dares not dispute them And this incestuous, sodomitical, poisoning pope occupied the venerated chair of the apostles as the head of the holy Church and the vicegerent of God on earth for eleven years. None of the adorers of the pontifical purple have undertaken to justify Alexander VI. His infamous life is an everlasting libel upon the pretensions of the papacy.

MARTIN LUTHER.

Hitherto the characters that have been treated in this volume have belonged to the great Christian Church, whose pontiffs ruled at Rome, and was known as the Romish Church, but now we have reached the times of the great Reformation, when certain interested parties in the Romish Church raised a protest against the rule of the pope and presumed to inaugurate a reign of their own. The Reformers, so called, of whom Luther was a prominent leader, did not condemn the mother Church as a church, nor the doctrines which she taught. They pronounced none of her dogmas fallacious, nor did they introduce new ones. They taught no new creed, nor did they pretend they wished to destroy the old one. It was simply a question of authority, or as to who should exercise that authority. It was a protest against the ruling pope and not against the Church and her doctrines. They did not claim to be moved or directed by divine inspiration; they wrought no pretended miracles; they laid no claim that they possessed divine authority. They acted simply on their natural rights as men protesting against a ruler whose authority was irksome to them, and which they wished to evade.

We have seen that their predecessors in the parent Church were not at all times governed by the purest and kindest motives that have been known to dwell in the human breast, and it remains to be seen whether those who have been styled Reformers greatly excelled their predecessors in all the good qualities which a pure religion ought to promote.

Martin Luther, the great German Reformer was born in 1483, of poor parents at Eisleben and received an education

which they hoped would fit him for the study and practice of law. The sudden death of a companion determined him in the choice of a monastic profession, and he entered a monastery at Erfurt. He here first saw a Bible and devoted himself to the study of it, aided by the writings of Augustine and others who had held similar opinions, so as to become no mean proficient in theological lore. His fame became such that he was appointed philosophical professor at Wittenburg through the influence of his superior, Staufitz. Shortly after he visited Rome and gained such an insight into the practical infidelity of the heads of the Church as doubtless influenced him not a little in the course he subsequently pursued. The next step in his life was to become a doctor of divinity, which of course increased his importance and weight as a teacher of theology.

Meanwhile, Tetzel had commenced his sale of indulgences, under the sanction of Pope Leo X., by which all sins possible to be committed were forgiven, and in this way an immense revenue was raised for the use of the pope. He came to Wittenburg. It is claimed by the friends of Luther that he became shocked with this most infamous traffic in which Tetzel, special agent of the pope, was engaged, and here was inaugurated his conflict with the pope. After some controversy, Cardinal DeVio, or Cajetan, was sent to bring the refractory monk to reason, but signally failed. Miltitz was next dispatched against him, with no better success. He held a second disputation with Dr. Eck, at Leipsic, but the doctor made little impression upon him, so that the pope resorted to his spiritual armory, and a bull was promulgated, requiring Luther's retraction of certain doctrines under pain of excommunication, and the books he had published were publicly burnt at Rome. From this time with no little personal bravery he openly menanced the head of the Church. He burnt the pope's bull at Wittenburg and was forthwith cast out of the Romish Church.

Soon after a diet of the empire was held at Worms, and Luther was summoned to give account of himself to it. He

went and maintained his ground with commendable independence, so that he was put under the imperial ban. Returning from Worms, he was by the kindness of his friend, the elector of Saxony, carried off secretly to the strong castle of Wartburg, and there he continued his studies, and translation of the Scriptures, as well as gaining health and resolution in his safe retreat. But the headlong haste of his disciples, Carlstadt and Melancthon, to rid themselves of the badge of Romanism made him, after a seclusion of ten months, suddenly leave his retirement and take part in the religious excitement which was spreading rapidly over the country and extending into Switzerland.

The followers of Luther increased rapidly. Erasmus wrote two treatises in partial opposition to Luther, but still coincided with him to considerable extent. They kept up a correspondence between them. The amiable Melancthon warmly espoused the cause of Luther, and firmly attached himself to the great German heretical leader.

It was in 1520 that the pope issued a formal condemnation of Luther, which, by the latter, was termed "the execrable bull of Antichrist." Two or three years later he published his translation of the New Testament, which received a large sale. In 1525 Luther married Catherine Von Bora, a nun who had escaped from a convent, upon which his enemies accused him of great impurity and immorality; but Luther defended himself upon spiritual grounds.

In 1529 the emperor convened a diet at Spires to procure aid from the German princes against the Turks, and to devise means for allaying religious disputes. In this assembly it was ordered that the mass should be universally observed throughout the empire. Against this decree the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg and other princes entered their protest, on which account the reform party received the name of *Protestants*. These princes then entered into a league for their mutual defense against the emperor, who was closely affiliated with the pope. In 1530 was drawn up by Melancthon and approved by Luther, the celebrated Confession of

Augsburg, which was received as the standard of Protestant faith in Germany.

In 1534 Luther's translation of the Bible was published, and from this time his life was mainly devoted to the consolidation of his work, in controversies with various opponents, and with public business which the reformed princes persisted in laying upon him by their ceaseless consultations. This dependence of the Reformation on the protection of these princes, although it had seemed to be of great use in the earliest part of the movement, now became a serious hindrance, for they expected it to declare on their side, the same as they had at first declared on its side; and Luther was thereby greatly annoyed and distracted At length wearied out of life with these annoyances and with his numerous labors, he died at the village where he was born, in 1546, at the age of sixty-three years.

He was an ambitious man, and one of great energy and industry. Besides translating the Bible, he was the author of numerous works, chiefly of a polemic and controversial character. He said of himself that he was the stout-hearted woodsman, who, by the main force of his arms, fells whole forests, the growth of centuries; and so makes way for the herdsman and the tiller of the ground to exercise their callings for the good of man. He was one of the men, though born in humble life, that wielded an important influence over his fellow-men, which remained behind him, and has remained there more than three hundred years since his death.

As the history of Luther is so closely blended with that of Pope Leo X., and his excesses and indulgences, it is but fitting that these claim a share of attention here. Leo X. was the son of Lorenzo de Medici. At the age of thirteen he had been elevated to the cardinalship by Innocent VIII. His education is said to have been entirely worldly, and he had no tinge of religious ideas. He ever affected a silly impiety, saying openly that religion was only good in order to restrain the common people in obedience, and ought not to govern the actions of the rich and powerful. He was

capable of committing any crime in order to obtain the desired end.

He was installed on the papal throne April 11, 1513, clothed with garments studded with diamonds and rubies, his head covered by a tiara so glittering with precious stones that it was impossible to look at it steadily. As soon as he was established in his kingly seat, he abandoned himself to luxury and debauchery. He invited to Rome many artists and authors, and his court soon became one of the most brilliant in Europe. If he banished to some extent brutal debauchery he introduced a more refined variety—a species of corruption less ignoble but more insidious and dangerous, inasmuch as it depraves society without drawing upon itself general reprobation. He at once studied the aggrandizement of his own family. He placed his brother Peter at the head of the government of Tuscany, and reserved for his brother Julian the crown of Naples, and made special efforts toward extending and strengthening his own authority. Luther charged him with totally denying the immortality of the soul.

His holiness seeing the disrepute attached to the papacy daily increasing, determined to re-brighten the lustre of the tiara by making the pontifical court the first in the world for its luxury, splendor, and magnificence; but the prodigious expense consequent upon such a course soon swallowed up the treasures amassed in the coffers of the Vatican, and ordinary resources becoming inadequate to supply the urgent demand for money, Leo was obliged to have recourse to extraordinary means. To effect this he revived the ancient tax on crimes, levied by John XXII. He changed some articles and added others, and caused large numbers to be printed and circulated throughout Europe, by which Christians were informed that the pope sold absolution for rape, adultery, incest, sodomy, bestiality, or assassination, and that for money they could purchase pardon for any crime—even parricide. He next published a crusade against the Turks in order to levy the tenths; this last mode, however, which had been a source of wonderful profit to his predecessors,

failed him. His agents returned from all directions empty handed.

When Leo thus found that his mode of raising money had proved abortive, he decided that he must hit upon some new expedient by which plentiful sums of money could be raised. This was the more necessary, as his creditors had become clamorous for their dues and threatened to make a grand explosion. Then it was that he organized, on a grand scale, the commerce in indulgences. In every province he appointed farmers-general, who kept their offices in churches or monasteries, and sold indulgences for the living and the dead; and in order that no village or hamlet should escape his rapacity, he sent legions of Dominican monks, who traversed town and country armed with bulls, and who levied contributions on the inhabitants. The following is the tenor of one of these singular forms of absolution, delivered by Arcembold, one of the farmers-general, in Saxony:

"As our Lord Jesus Christ absolves you by the merits of his passion, I, by his authority, and that of the blessed apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, and that of our most holy Father, absolve you from all ecclesiastical censures under which you may have fallen, from all sins, delinquencies, or excesses which you may have committed, or shall commit hereafter, how great soever they may be, and I make you a partaker in all the spiritual merits accorded by the Church militant to its members. I restore you to the holy sacraments, to the unity of the faithful, to purity and innocence as of an infant newly born who comes to receive baptism, so that the gate of hell shall be shut against you, and that of paradise shall be opened to you on your death. Amen."

John Tetzel, the bullist who was sent into Saxony, was so impudent as to spread about obscene circulars, by means of which he outdid his colleagues in obtaining dupes. He entered into the most cynical details of the sins he could absolve, and ended by the singular allocution: "Yes, my brethren, his holiness (the pope) has conferred upon me a power so great, that the gates of heaven would open at my voice, even before a sinner who had committed the worst crime which a thought can conceive." This infamous agent of the pope granted indulgences, called personal, by means of which a Christian could remit the crimes of ten person of his

selection ninety-nine times a year. He sold the power of delivering as many souls from purgatory as one should enter or come forth from a Church during the twenty-four hours which elapsed between the first and second days of August every year. For a small sum he diminished by eighty thousand years the pains of purgatory to those who visited a church consecrated to St. Sebastian, and four thousand years to those who went at certain epochs into churches dedicated to the Virgin; he even sold for a rather large sum the power of constraining the mother of the saved to come in person and announce to the faithful the day and the hour of their death. But that which beyond all contradiction brought most money to the holy see was a bull by virtue of which Leo decreed that banditti could so settle matters with the pontifical commissaries or their delegate that by surrendering a part of their spoils they could enjoy at peace the fruits of their rapine. His holiness granted them full and entire absolution, even though they were assassins, or despoilers of the widow and the orphan, or even carried off the property of hospitals or pious legacies destined for the endowment of poor young girls, or robbed families of their inheritances by means of false titles or forged wills, or though they had pillaged churches and monasteries. The pope excepted nothing but robberies committed on the holy see.

The Dominicans, the peddlers of the apostolic bulls, acquitted themselves admirably in their mission, and announced to the faithful that it was better for them to die of famine in this world than lose the chance of purchasing their eternal safety in the next. As for themselves, they led a gay life, passing their days in playing at dice or cards, and their nights in swilling wine in the public taverns. "These braggarts, these porters of absolution, of relics, and of rogations, these hypocrites who speculate in pictures of saints and images of the lamb, these rogues who flatter their dupes in order to pick their pockets, and who rob the simple of even to their shirt," says the ardent Catholic, Oliver Maillard, "I have heard them boast of having drawn from a poor village even

a thousand crowns for indulgences, without counting the hundred pounds they had paid to the curate for his good will."

Father Thomas, whom Florimond de Raymond quotes in his works as one of the best and most orthodox men of his time, thus, in his sermons, expresses his opinion of the bullist: "Behold these robbers sent out by the pope! See how they decoy the poor people; they travel over hill and plain despoiling the simple of their last penny, and in order to rob at their ease they make a bargain with the priests. 'We carry the indulgences,' they say; 'curate, assemble thy flock, we will pick them together and have a frolic under the very beards of the imbeciles;' and these infamous priests, these concubine-keeping, drunken, and mercenary curates, in order the better to fill their bellies and keep their mistresses, enter into a compact with these porters of bulls, extort, pillage, and rob the idiots who open their purses to deliver their souls from purgatory. They then take their pastimes together, and say, 'Let us have a good time; let us enjoy our lechery, and make a feast; a bull will pay for it all!' O, my God! who can recount the horrid acts these Dominicans commit in this shameful traffic of indulgences."

In the mean time the measure of the scandal was full; a universal cry of indignation was raised against the holy see. Bold men cried out to the people, "Draw away from the dominion of the popes, those shameless thieves who have made the temple of Christ a cave of robbers," and one who joined heartily in this cry was Martin Luther. The vile conduct here recited awakened the better instincts of his nature and impelled him to raise his voice against the outrage.

D'Aubigné, in his "History of the Reformation," p. 103, gives the following touching the sale of indulgences: "A great agitation reigned at that time among the people of Germany. The Church had opened a vast market on the earth. Judging from the crowd of buyers, and the noise and jests of the dealers, we might call it a fair; but a fair held by monks. The merchandise they extolled, offering it at a reduced price, was, said they, the salvation of souls.

"The dealers passed through the country in a gay carriage, escorted by three horsemen, in great state, and spending freely. One might have thought it some dignitary on a royal progress, with his attendants and officers, and not a common dealer or a begging monk. When the procession approached a town, a messenger waited on the magistrate. 'The grace of God and of the holy Father is at your gates,' said the envoy. Instantly everything was in motion in the place. The clergy, the priests, the nuns, the council, the schoolmasters, the trades with their flags, men and women, young and old, went forth to meet the merchants with lighted tapers in their hands, advancing to the sound of music and of all the bells of the place, 'so that,' says a historian, 'they could not have given a grander welcome to God himself.' Salutations being exchanged, the whole procession moved towards the church. The pontiff's bull of grace was borne in front on a velvet cushion or on cloth of gold. The chief vender of indulgences followed, supporting a large red wooden cross; and the whole procession moved in this manner, amidst singing, prayers, and the smoke of incense. A sound of organs and a concert of instruments received the monkish dealer and his attendants into the church. The cross he bore with him was erected in front of the altar; on it was hung the pope's arms; and as long as it remained there the clergy of the place, the penitentiaries, and the sub-commissioners, with white wands in their hands, came every day after vespers, or before the salutation, to do homage to it. This great bustle excited a lively sensation in the quiet towns of Germany.

"One person in particular drew the attention of the spectators in these sales. It was he who bore the great red cross, and had the most prominent part assigned to him. He was clothed in the habit of the Dominicans, and his port was lofty. His voice was sonorous, and he seemed yet in the prime of his strength, though he was past his sixty-third year. This man, who was the son of a goldsmith of Leipsic, named Diez, bore the name of John Diezel or Tetzel. He had studied in his native town, had taken his bachelor's degree in

1487, and entered two years later into the order of the Dominicans. Numerous honors had been accumulated on him. Bachelor of Theology, Prior of the Dominicans, Apostolic Commissioner, Inquisitor (*hereticæ pravitatis inquisitor*), he had ever since the year 1502 filled the office of an agent for the sale of indulgences. The experience he had acquired as a subordinate functionary had very early raised him to the station of chief commissioner. He had an allowance of eighty florins per month, all his expenses defrayed, and he was allowed a carraige and three horses; but we may readily imagine that his indirect emoluments far exceeded his allowances. In 1507 he gained in two days at Freiburg two thousand florins. If his occupation resembled that of a mountebank, he had also the morals of one. Convicted at Innspruck of adultery and abominable profligacy, he was near paying the forfeit of his life. The Emperor Maximilian had ordered that he should be put into a sack and thrown into the river. The Elector Frederic of Saxony had interceded for him and obtained his pardon. But the lesson he had received had not taught him more decency. He carried about with him two of his children. Miltitz, the popes' legate, cites the fact in one of his letters. It would have been hard to find in all the cloisters of Germany a man more adapted to the traffic with which he was charged. To the theology of a monk and the zeal and spirit of an inquisitor he united the greatest effrontery. What most helped him in his office was the facility he displayed in the invention of the strange stories, with which the taste of the common people is generally pleased. No means came amiss to him to fill his coffers. Lifting up his voice and giving loose to a coarse volubility, he offered his indulgences to all comers, and excelled any salesman at a fair in recommending his merchandise.

"As soon as the the cross was elevated with the pope's arms suspended upon it, Tetzel ascended the pulpit, and with a bold tone began, in the presence of the crowd whom the ceremony had drawn to the sacred spot, to exalt the efficacy of indulgences. The people listened and wondered at the admi-

rable virtues ascribed to them. A Jesuit historian says himself, in speaking of the Dominican friars whom Tetzel had associated with him: 'Some of these preachers did not fail, as usual, to distort their subject, and so to exaggerate the value of the indulgences as to lead the people to believe that, as soon as they gave their money they were certain of salvation and of the deliverance of souls from purgatory.'

"If such were the pupils, we may imagine to what lengths the master went. Let us hear one of these harangues pronounced after the erection of the cross:

"'Indulgences,' said he, 'are the most sublime and precious of God's gifts. This cross [pointing to the red cross] has as much efficacy as the cross of Jesus Christ. Draw near and I will give you letters, duly sealed, by which even the sins you shall hereafter desire to commit shall all be forgiven you. I would not exchange my privileges for those of St. Peter in heaven; for I have saved more souls with my indulgences than he with his sermons. There is no sin so great that the indulgence cannot remit it; and even if any one should (which is, doubtless, impossible) ravish the holy Virgin Mother of God, let him pay, let him only pay largely, and it shall be forgiven him. Even repentance is not indispensable. But more than all this, indulgences save not the living alone, but also save the dead. Ye priests, ye nobles, ye tradesmen, ye wives, ye maidens, and ye young men, hearken to your departed parents and friends who cry to you from the bottomless abyss: 'We are enduring horrible torment; a small alms would deliver us; you can give it, and you will not.'

"A shudder ran through his hearers at these words, uttered by the formidable voice of the mountebank monk, 'The very moment,' continued Tetzel, 'that the money clinks against the bottom of the chest the soul escapes from purgatory and flies free to heaven. O senseless people, and almost like to beasts, who do not comprehend the grace so richly offered! This day heaven is on all sides open. Do you now refuse to enter? When, then, do you intend to come

in? This day you may redeem many souls. Dull and heedless man, with ten groschen you can deliver your father from purgatory; and you are so ungrateful that you will not rescue him. In the day of judgment my conscience will be clear; but you will be punished the more severely for neglecting so great a salvation. I protest that though you should have only one coat, you ought to strip it off and sell it, to purchase this grace. Our Lord God no longer deals with us as God. He has given all power to the pope. . . . Do you know why our most holy Lord distributes so rich a grace? The dilapidated church of St. Peter and St. Paul is to be restored so as to be unparalleled in the whole earth. That church contains the bodies of the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, and a vast company of martyrs. Those sacred bodies, owing to the present condition of the edifice, are now, alas! continually trodden, flooded, polluted, dishonored, and rotting in rain and hail. Ah! shall these holy ashes be suffered to remain degraded in the mire?'

"This touch of description never failed to produce an impression on many hearers. There was an eager desire to aid poor Leo X., who had not the means of sheltering from the rain the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul."

Much more in the same vein might be given descriptive of the hypocritical and despicable means used by the agent of the pope to play upon the ignorance and the fears of the populace in effecting sales for worthless indulgences, but what has been quoted will doubtless suffice.

We will next cite a few passages from the sermons of Cordolier Thomas, and also of Oliver Maillard, two earnest and devoted orthodox ecclesiastics of the time, by which will easily be seen the light in which they regarded the outrages here alluded to: "How long shall we be scandalized by your adulteries and your incests, ye unworthy priests?" cried the monk Thomas from the gallery of the cathedral of Bordeaux. "When will you cease to fill your gross stomachs with dainty food and sparkling wine? When will you cease to steal money from the poor in order to have a concubine in your bed, a fat

mule in your stable, and all by the grace of the crucifix, and taking the trouble to say *Dominus vobiscum?*"

"I know you will reply: What matters it to you if the poor shall fall famished at your gates; nevertheless, have you no shame in selling the sacraments and devouring the goods of widows and orphans, under pretext of solacing souls in purgatory? Curses upon you, ministers of Satan, who seduce young girls and married females, and who learn from them at confession the means of drawing them into sin. Shame on you, priests of Lucifer, who dare to use the accursed art which your character gives you over credulous minds in order to initiate the young into foul pleasures. Shame on you who make of your parsonages houses of infamy, where you rear young girls and young boys for lust and infamy! Shame on you who do not fear to show to your friends the mysteries of these new seraglios, and to gorge yourselves in them with wine, viands, and luxury. Have I not heard with my own ears, the curate James boast before an assemblage of infamous ecclesiastics that he played, swore, drank, and fornicated better than any of them?"

Maillard, who had been preacher to Louis XI., thundered with still greater force against the crime and infamy of the priests. "I see," said he, "Abbots, priests, monks, and even prelates, heaping up treasures on treasures, accumulating prebendaries and benefices and decoying Christians, like pickpockets. I see the cape, the frock, and the pallium entering taverns by day and night, for the purpose of debauch. Canons or clerks, elevated to dignities, themselves govern places of prostitution; they sell the wine, and hold the pledges as the bullies of the girls. I have seen others who walk insolently disguised as soldiers, or clothed as dandies, with their beards fashionably trimmed, with women of pleasure lounging on their arms. I know a bishop who is every night served at supper by young girls entirely naked; and I know another who keeps a seraglio of young girls, whom he calls prostitutes in moulting. Shameful as all these things are, there exist others still more infamous.

Bishops no longer give away livings but at the request of females; that is to say, when the mother, sister, nieces, or cousins of the candidates have paid the price of them with their honor.

"Speak, ye infamous priests and bishops, ye blessed simoniacs, ye blessed concubine-keepers, ye blessed drunkards and bullies, ye blessed procurers, who gain orders by rendering foul services! Go to the devil, ye infamous wretches! At the hour of your death, will you dare to present yourselves before Christ full of wine holding in your hand the gold which you have stolen, and having on your arm the prostitutes you have kept, or your mistress-servants, or your nieces, who are most frequently your bastards and your concubines, or the girls whose dowry you have gained for them by impurity, or the mother from whom you have purchased the virginity of their daughters? Go to all the devils, cohorts of thieves and pilferers!

"I know well that in exposing your crimes I run the risk of being assassinated, as has already happened to those who desired to reform chapters and monasteries; but the fear of your daggers will not chain my tongue nor arrest the lightning of my indignation. I will tell the whole truth. Come forward, then, ye women who abandon your bodies to official persons, to monks, priests, and bishops. Come forward, ye who wear chains and robes with trains, and who say, when I blame your luxuriousness: 'Why, father, we have seen other women still better dressed than we are, who are neither richer nor nobler than we. Besides, when we have no money, the prelates give us as much as we could earn by the sweat of our bodies.'

"Come forward, ye female drunkards and robbers—ye priestesses of Venus—who dare to say, 'If a priest gets me with child, I will not be the only one.' Come forward, nuns and beguines, who people the cisterns and ponds of the convents with the dead bodies of new-born children. What frightful accusations would you not hear if all those children which are cast into closets or pits could name their execu-

tioners or their fathers. Shall not the rain of fire, which formerly destroyed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, fall on these convents? Shall not all these priests and bishops be swallowed up as were Korah, Dathan, and Abiram? Yes, my brethren, the time is approaching in which God will do justice on all this brood of idlers, of mute dogs, of ignorant wretches, of leechers, robbers, and murderers?"

The sale of indulgences was introduced into Switzerland by a notorious Capuchin monk named Sancho, and although the infamy was zealously opposed by the Swiss reformer, Zwingle, so great was the superstition of the people and so completely were they under the control of their ecclesiastical leaders that the monk was enabled to carry with him out of that small country more than one hundred and twenty thousand ducats.

In commenting on this result De Cormenin, vol. ii, p. 184 says: "The Swiss, were not, however, long in recovering from their taste for spiritual favors, and regretted the gold which the Roman court had wrenched from their credulity. The indulgences were everywhere an object of reproach among the faithful; but what cared Leo X., for the blame of virtuous people; gold was necessary for his luxurious tastes; he needed it for his political intrigues; it was necessary for his debauches, and the sale of indulgences was a true Pactolus, which drifted into his treasury all the gold of Christendom. As he feared lest the preaching of the reformers might arrest in some countries the enthusiasm for indulgences, he published a new decree, providing that the sovereign pontiff in his capacity of successor of St. Peter, and vicar of Jesus Christ, was irresistibly empowered to remit, by virtue of the keys, the guilt and penalty of sins; that he remitted guilt by the sacrament of penance, and temporal punishment by means of indulgences, and representing the superabundance of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints. The pope added that belief in these articles was indispensible for an orthodox Christian, and that those who believed or taught a contrary doctrine should be cut off from the communion of the

Catholic Church; he declared them to be anathematized, and denounced them, as well as their adherents, or those who granted them asylum or protection, to the inquisitors as heretics.

"This ill-timed decree had a very different effect from that which Leo X. expected; a general reprobation awaited the bulls of the Roman court. Luther published a terrible work against the popes; he attacked the pontifical infallibility, and proved that the successors of the apostles were not exempt from common imperfections, since St. Peter himself had erred, and had been reprimanded by St. Paul, for having abused his authority and oppressed the faithful. He appealed from all the pursuits of Leo X. to a general council lawfully assembled, and representing the whole Church; he also protested against all excommunications, depositions, or interdicts, until judgment had been pronounced by the Fathers.

"Notwithstanding the violence of Luther's attacks, such was the blindness at the court of Leo that no one answered the reformer; his holiness changed none of his modes of action, and pursued his plans of family aggrandizement."

In giving an account of the operations in Sweden under the auspices of the pope, by the infamous Christian, king of Denmark, the same author (p. 185) continues: "By virtue of the bull of excommunication fulminated by Leo X., all Sweden having been declared heretical, the king prepared a list of proscription of all those whose influence over the masses he feared and under pretext of obeying the orders of the pope, he caused them to be arrested, and judged at once by a commission of priests and inquisitors. On the day fixed for the punishment soldiers occupied the streets of Stockholm, and prevented the inhabitants from showing themselves at their doors or windows; the prisoners were led out on the great place, and the heads of ninety-four nobles fell beneath the axe of the executioner. This first butchery was but the prelude to greater atrocities; on the next day gallows were erected, and a double number of burghers and nobles were launched into eternity; on the third and fourth days, the executions continued,

only the mode was changed. On the first day, they had been beheaded, on the second hung, on the third day they flayed the sufferers, on the fourth quartered them, and on the fifth, burned them alive; finally, when the great square was covered with dead bodies and bones and the population had been reduced one fifth, Christian quitted Stockholm to visit other cities of Sweden, in which the same scenes of barbarity were renewed. He left everywhere bloody marks of his passage, murdering women, children, and old men, even his satellites themselves, when they allowed sentiments of pity to appear for the unfortunates whom they were constrained to torture.

"Frightful as were these executions—advised by the court of Rome, they do not approach, neither in the number of victims nor the refinement of punishments, the cruelties of the Spanish priests in Mexico, who murdered several millions of Indians in the name of the God of Peace and by virtue of a bull from Leo X. Whilst the fanatical and cruel Spaniards were reducing a new world to the Catholic religion, the doctrines of Luther were preparing the emancipation of Germany. It was not the elector of Saxony alone who protected the illustrious Reformer; he was sustained by powerful lords, illustrious generals, renowned captains, nobles, who reclaimed the possession of wealth on which convents and churches had seized; by the burghers and the people, who were all tired of seeing their spoils pass into the hands of the agents of the pope. Every one listened with enthusiasm to the preaching of Luther on religious liberty, the despotism of the bishops of Rome, the splendor of the pontifical court, the corruption of the clergy, and the dissoluteness of monks and nuns.

"Leo X. finally discovered, by the rapid strides which the reform ideas were making, that the struggle was a serious one, and that he had not an instant to lose in arresting the evil and striking a great blow. He then wrote to Charles V. that he must arrest the preacher, Martin Luther, to be judged and condemned by the holy Inquisition. But the thing was not so easy as the pope had imagined; the emperor replied

that it would be imprudent at that time to make an attempt upon the freedom of a citizen of Germany without some motive, and that it was not in that country as in Spain or Italy; and that, moreover, he had not received the imperial crown, and could not, consequently, exercise any jurisdiction. He promised, however, as soon as his coronation was over, he would convene a general diet to judge the reformer; and he pledged himself to have him condemned and given up to the officers of the Inquisition. Charles besought the pope to fulminate, as a preliminary step, a new bull of anathema against the doctrines of Luther, so as to strike dread into the minds of the German nobles, and render his condemnation still more certain. His holiness followed the advice of the emperor, and published the famous bull which commences with these words: 'Arise, my God, and defend your cause.'

"After this exordium, the pope addressed the apostles, Peter and Paul, to demand their aid, and terminates by this appeal to the faithful: 'An enraged heretic rends us furiously, and blasphemes the holy pontiffs, our predecessors. Like the serpent, he spreads the venom of calumny by his bite, so that the feeble, whose minds have been blinded by falsehoods, are unwilling to longer believe in the gospel of Christ, and have taken the side of this innovator, or, rather, have enrolled themselves under the banner of the devil. It is on this account that we have judged it important for the safety of Christendom formally to condemn forty-one propositions drawn from the writings of this reprobate as being heretical, false, scandalous, contrary to Catholic truth, and capable of seducing the simple. We, consequently, prohibit, under penalty of excommunication and deprivation of the sacraments, belief in these propositions, their maintenance, preaching, and tolerating others to teach them, directly, or indirectly, in public or private, tacitly, or in express terms. We also order complete and exact search for the books which contain them to be made in all the provinces, and that they be solemnly burned in the presence of the clergy and before the people, under the penalty of the most terrible censures of

the Church.' In this bull, Leo X. defines the condemned propositions, and relates, in all their details, the efforts which had been made to bring back Luther to the true light and pluck him from the abyss into which he had plunged.

"This bull was a subject of controversy and criticism on the part of men of letters and politicians in Europe, not only for its judicial formulary, but even for its obscure style, for his holiness had not feared to use sentences which contained more than four hundred and fifty words. All powerless and ridiculous, as was the decree of this pope, the reformer penetrated his intentions in his preaching. He declaimed against the pontiff and his adherents; he called down the curses of the people on them; and not content with exciting Germany by his powerful language, he inundated Europe with his satirical writings; finally, in a public discourse, he tore the bull of the holy Father; he called it an execrable production of Antichrist; 'and even let Satan excommunicate me,' said he, 'I anathematize him in my turn, and as they burn my writings at Rome, I give to the flames the bulls and decretals of this prince of darkness, and I adjure all men to come to assist me in casting into the same funeral pile Leo X. and the pontifical chair.' At the same time he caused a brazier to be brought, and burned the bull of the pope.

"Thus this step of the holy Father only resulted in showing to the nations what an immense progress the reform had made, since a mere monk could publicly annihilate the bulls of a pope, an act of unheard of audacity, and which no emperor had even dared to do.

"Leo X. did not, however, regard himself as conquered. Charles V. was about to convene a diet at Worms to condemn Luther, and the legate, Jerome Alexander, charged with sustaining the accusation, had promised to take such measures that their enemy in any case, condemned or absolved, could not escape them.

"Notwithstanding the entreaties of his disciples, who all besought him not to go to Worms, the intrepid reformer persisted in demanding a safe-conduct from the emperor, that he

might appear before the assembly; and as his friends objected to him that the dangers he had incurred at Augsburg should make him dread fresh treason, he replied: 'Though I were certain of finding at Worms as many devils as there are tiles on the houses, I have determined to face them.' He, however, consented that a hundred gentlemen, armed at all points, should escort him. He entered with them into Worms, mounted on a chariot, and followed by a prodigious concourse of people, whom his reputation had attracted. On the day succeeding his arrival, the diet opened its sittings, and the Roman legate proceeded to interrogate Luther. The latter replied to all the questions, avowed himself to be the author of the criminated works, and offered to defend his opinions in a public conference.

"At this proposition the Cardinal Jerome Alexander expressed surprise. He pretended that the scandal was great enough already; that the debates should be secret, and that the accused should only be allowed to speak before his judges. Luther replied that he had come without fear into the midst of his enemies, to justify himself in the face of day from the accusations brought against him, and not cowardly to defend his doctrines in darkness and mystery. In vain did the legate and Charles V. himself endeavor to gain him to the cause of the pope, by offering him enormous benefices, a bishopric, and a cardinal's hat; it was all useless. They then determined to place him under the ban of the empire, and not daring to arrest him among a population enthusiastic for reform, nor to make an attempt on his life, they gave him twenty-one days in which to leave the German States. Luther, however, did not quit his country; he took refuge in the castle of Wartburg, where the Elector Frederic concealed him for nine whole months.

"The emperor published an edict, in which, after having explained that it was to the interest of kings to protect Catholicism and stifle heresies, he added: 'That to satisfy his obligations to God and the pope, with the consent of the electors, princes, and the States of the empire, and in execu-

tion of the bull of Leo X., he declared and held Martin Luther as a heretic, and commanded him to be regarded as such by all the subjects placed beneath his rule, ordering them, under the most severe penalties, to seize and imprison him, and to pursue his accomplices, adherents, and favorers; prohibiting, besides, from printing, transcribing, reading, or having any of his books or the abridgements published in various languages; and proscribing also engravings, in which the pope, cardinals, and prelates were represented with ridiculous habits, or in cynical postures; finally the prince formally prohibited the printing of any book on religious subjects without having first submitted it to the ordinary, or censor of the pope.'

"This edict of Charles V., had no more influence over the minds of men than the bull of Leo X., and did not stop for a moment the progress of the reform; nay, more, this new persecution gave rise to thousands of apostles who associated together for the great work of religious emancipation; and soon the papacy had to combat enemies the more to be dreaded, as they devoted their lives to the cause of the people and had determined to overthrow the pontifical colossus, though they should be crushed beneath its ruins. The clergy then uttered a cry of alarm from all sides; from the east, west, north, and south, kings, nobles, monks, priests, bishops, cardinals, led about the torches of fanaticism, armed themselves with daggers, and prepared to struggle against an enemy who threatened to destroy forever their execrable power. All accused the pontiff of weakness, pussillanimity, incapacity; all reproached him for his pompous life of worldly pleasures, the chase, spectacles, concerts, banquets, and saturnalia; all called down the curses of God on the pope, who had left the door of the sanctuary open to the enemy, and who had not defended the theocratic edifice.

"In that Leo X. was not exempt from blame, and the energy which his holiness had displayed in the beginning of his pontificate, was prodigiously modified since the death of his brother and nephew. Having no longer the aggrandize-

ment of his family to occupy him, the pope had passed his time in pleasure; the chase, says Paul Jovius, was especially his favorite exercise; he knew its laws better than those of Scripture. He punished with blows, says the historian, those who, by imprudence or want of skill, allowed the beast to escape, and his humor was so ill when the hunt was unsuccessful that his minions and mistresses dared not even speak to him. But when his blows had struck down the beast, when he had killed a tall stag or vigorous wild boar, his joy resembled delirium, and at these moments he never refused the favors and benefices which were asked of him.

"The nights passed in interminable festivities, in which the luxury of lights and of the table service surpassed everything in the most opulent courts of Europe and Asia. No emperor, king, or pope ever carried his epicurism so far as Leo X.; thus the highest employments awaited the invention of a new ragout. His holiness had four masters of the art occupied in inventing unheard of dishes; it is to their care that humanity owes sausages stuffed with slices of peacocks, and in return for this useful invention, the faithful had only to pay seven millions a year for the table of the pope.

"In the festivals of the Vatican numerous buffoons were employed to enliven the guests by their gay sallies, to which Leo X. replied, to show the fancy of his mind, and strove with them in cynicism in language and frivolity in ideas. Young girls and handsome boys clothed in Oriental costumes and expert in the arts of debauchery, had orders to caress the guests, and these festivities were terminated, almost always, by orgies only excelled by those of the Borgias.

"Still, amidst these revels, the pontiff did not entirely forget the interests of the throne of the Church, and followed the policy of his predecessors; for at the very time that he was selling to Francis I. authority to conquer Naples, he was demanding six thousand ducats from Charles V., to grant him the right to style himself king of Naples and emperor of Germany, notwithstanding the bulls of the pontiffs, which prohibited the two crowns from being placed on the same head. He

also pursued his conquests in Romagna, carried the cities of Modena and Reggio by assault, and thought of seizing on Ferrara, the capital of the States of Alphonso of Este. This last effort failed; a plot which he formed to assassinate the duke, met with no better success; he then had recourse to spiritual thunders, and fulminated a terrible sentence of anathema against Alphonso, placed his states under interdict, and ordered his generals to recruit new troops, to retake the offensive and crush the enemy.

"The war already embraced upper Italy. On one side Charles V., aided by the English and the pope, was laying claim to the duchy of Milan, as a fief of the empire, as well as the county of Burgundy, which he pretended had been fraudulently united to France by Louis XI.; on the other side Francis I., aided by the Swiss and the Venetians, was demanding the restitution of Spanish Navarre, and threatening to make good his pretensions on Naples. But the French, inferior in numbers to their enemies, suffered several checks, and were constrained to abandon most of the cities they had recently conquered, and retire to Milan.

"This news caused such joy to Leo X., say several chroniclers of the times, that the blood flowed back on his heart and suffocated him. According to another version, the holy Father died of poison; historians do not designate the author of the crime, but merely say Charles V. knew how to turn this event to his advantage. Still the blow was so sudden that they could not administer the Viaticum to the holy Father. He died on the first of December, 1521, aged forty-four years, after having occupied the holy see eight years, eight months, and twenty days."

These historical facts in reference to the sale of indulgences and the career of Leo X. are so intimately connected with that of Martin Luther that they could not properly be omitted.

The greatest differences exist as to the characters imputed to Luther and his fellow Reformers; their followers and admirers laud them to the skies and make them out to be

saints of the highest type, while their opponents of the parent Church make them out to be miserable miscreants and criminals unworthy the respect or esteem of men. The truth is probably to be found, where it often is, between the two extremes. The brief sketch already given is from Protestant sources, and appended will be given some comments from the other side, to wit, M. J. Spalding, D.D., archbishop of Baltimore, in his "History of the Protestant Reformation." He represents Luther to have been mainly a worthy individual so long as he remained in the Catholic Church, but that he became a depraved man when he left it. He, however, speaks of his boyhood days in the following words: "Luther seems to have been a very naughty boy; for while at school at Mansfield, his master flogged him fifteen times in one day" (p. 73). After narrating his commendable career up to the time of the Reformation, he thus continues: "Such was Luther before he began the Reformation in 1517. How changed, alas! was he after this period—*heu! quantum mutatus ab illo!* He is no longer the humble monk, the scrupulous priest, the fervent Christian, that he was before! Amidst the storm which he excited, he gradually suffered shipwreck of almost every virtue and became reckless and depraved; the mere creature of impulse, the child of pride, the victim of violent and degrading passions. . . . For him, at least, the Reformation was a down-hill business; and according to D'Aubigné's test, this was its general tendency. His own deterioration and the work of the Reformation were both gradual, and they went hand in hand. He did not at first seem to aim at any change in doctrines and institutions of the Catholic Church; this thought was developed afterwards. In the thirty-eighth, sixty-seventh, and seventy-first of his ninety-five theses published against Tetzel on the first of November, 1517, he expressly maintained the authority of the pope and the Catholic doctrine on indulgences. He professed only to aim at the correction of abuses. It is a mooted question whether jealousy of the Dominican order, which had been entrusted with the preaching of indulgences, to the exclusion

of his own rival order of the Augustinians, influenced him in his first attack on Tetzel" (p. 77).

On May 30, 1518, Luther wrote a letter to Pope Leo X., of which the following is the concluding passage:

"Therefore, most holy Father, I throw myself at the feet of your holiness, and submit myself to you with all that I have and all that I am. Destroy my cause or espouse it; pronounce either for or against me; take my life or restore it as you please; I will receive your voice as that of Christ himself, who presides and speaks through you. If I have deserved death I refuse not to die; the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof; may he be praised forever and ever. May he maintain you to all eternity! Amen."

The sequel tested the sincerity of his protestation. But even just near the very time he was penning this very letter he preached from the pulpit at Wittenburg against the power of the pope to fulminate excommunication and he was engaged in circulating inflammatory tracts breathing the same spirit.

To show the falseness of the man's heart it may be stated that in February, 1519, he wrote a letter to Spalatin, in which he said: "Let me whisper in your ear; I do not know whether the pope is Antichrist, or only his apostle," and-so-forth; and yet in a month after that time, March 3, 1519, he wrote these words of reverence and submission to Pope Leo X:

"Most holy Father, I declare in the presence of God, and of all the world, I have never sought, nor will I ever seek, to weaken by force or artifice the power of the Roman Church, or of your holiness. I confess that there is nothing in heaven or earth that should be preferred above that Church, save only Jesus Christ the Lord of all."

In commenting upon this exhibition of duplicity, the archbishop writes thus (p. 82): "The same man who wrote this impugned the primacy of the pope the very same year in the discussion with Dr. Eck at Leipsic. Was he—could he be sincere in all this? But, further, when on the third of October, 1520, he became acquainted with the bull of Leo X., by which his doctrines were condemned, he wrote these remarkable words: 'I will treat it as a forgery, though I believe it to be genuine.' . . . In his famous harangue against

Carlstadt and the image breakers, delivered from the pulpit of the church of All Saints at Wittenburg, he plainly said that if his recreant disciples would not take his advice, he would not hesitate to retract everything he had either taught or written, and leave them, and added emphatically, 'This I tell you once for all.'" As an evidence of the motives that actuated him, a clause from his abridged confession of faith is given. It reads: "I abolished the elevation of the host to spite the pope, and I had retained it so long to spite Carlstadt."

In speaking of the passions of Luther, the archbishop (p. 87) writes thus: "His passions were violent, and he seems to have made little effort to govern them. His violence, in fact, often drove him to the very verge of insanity. His cherished disciple, Melancthon, deplored his furious outbursts of temper: 'I tremble when I think of the passions of Luther: they yield not in violence to the passions of Hercules.' The weak and timid disciple had reason to tremble, for he testifies that Luther occasionally inflicted on him personal chastisement."

On page 91 the archbishop gives this paragraph: "Luther's standard of morality was about as high as that of his good breeding. St. Paul tells us that 'a Christian's conversation is in heaven.' Luther's, on the contrary, was not only earthly, but often immoral and revolting in the extreme. He discussed, in all their most disgusting details, subjects which St. Paul would not have so much as 'named among Christians.' His famous "Table Talk" is full of such specimens of the new gospel decency. Wine and women, the pope and the devil, are the principal subjects of which the reformer liked to treat, when alone with his intimate friends, in private and unreserved conversation. For fifteen years—from 1525 to 1540—he usually passed the evenings at the Black Eagle tavern of Wittenburg, where he met and conversed, over the ale-jug, with his bosom friends, Melancthon, Amsdorf, Aurifaber, Justus Jonas, Lange, Link, and Stauptz. His disciples carefully collected and published these conversations

of their 'beloved master' as so many precious oracles from heaven, delivered by the mouth of the new apostle."

The archbishop gives these extracts from Luther's "Table Talk" which doubtless are more shocking to him than to the ordinary Liberals of this age: "May the name of the pope be damned; may his reign be abolished; may his will be restrained! If I thought God did not hear my prayer I would address the Devil." Again: "I owe more to my dear Catherine and to Philip than to God himself." Finally: "God has made many mistakes. I would have given him good advice had I assisted at the creation. I would have made the sun shine incessantly; the day would have been without end." And thus continues the archbishop: "It is not a little remarkable that from the date of his conference with the devil, Luther's moral career was constantly downward; until at last he reached the lowest grade of infamy, and became utterly steeped in vice" (p. 93, 94).

On page 120, the archbishop speaks as follows as to Luther's motives in originating his opposition to the Church: "The reformation of abuses in the matter of indulgences was but a pretext; the real motives of Luther and his partisans were very different, as the result proved. The pope, through his legates, had done everything that could have been reasonably asked for the removal of the evils complained of. If the court of Rome was guilty of any fault, it was of excessive leniency, to Luther, and of too great a spirit of conciliation towards his partisans." In the same connection a quotation is made from D'Aubigné the ardent Protestant historian:

"In fact Rome was brought into the necessity of stern severity. The gauntlet was thrown down, the combat must be to the death. It was not the abuses of the Pontiff's authority that Luther had attacked. At his bidding the pope was required to descend meekly from his throne, and become again a simple pastor or bishop on the banks of the Tiber."

The following extracts from Luther's own writings, and the writings of his co-reformers and contemporaries will assist in

forming a correct estimate of the character of the man They are taken from a work entitled "An Amicable Discussion of the Church of England, and the Reformation in General," by Bishop Trevern. Appendix p. 52. Thus wrote Luther:

1. "I burn with a thousand flames in my unsubdued flesh: I feel myself carried on with a rage towards women that approaches to madness. I, who ought to be fervent in spirit, am only fervent in impurity" (Table Talk).

2. "To the best of my judgment, there is neither emperor, king, nor devil to whom I would yield; no, I would not yield to the whole world" (Idem).

3. "He was so well aware of his immorality, as we are informed by his favorite disciple, that he wished they would remove him from the office of preaching" (Sleiden. Book ii, 1520).

4. "His timid companion acknowledges he had received blows from him, *ab ipso colaphos accepi*" (Melancthon. Letter to Theodore).

5. "I tremble (wrote he to the same friend) when I think of the passions of Luther; they yield not in violence to the passions of Hercules" (Ibid).

6. "This man," said one of his contemporary reformers, "is absolutely mad. He never ceases to combat truth against all justice, even against the cry of our own conscience" (Hospenian).

7. "He is puffed up with pride and arroganee, and seduced by Satan" (Œcolampadius).

8. "Yes, the devil has made himself master of Luther to such a degree as to make one believe that he wishes to gain entire possession of him" (Zuinglius).

"I wonder no more, O Luther," wrote Henry VIII. to him, "that thou art not in good earnest ashamed, and that thou darest to lift up thy eyes before God or man, seeing thou hast been so light and so inconsistent as to allow thyself to be transported by the instigation of the devil to thy foolish concupiscences. Thou, a brother of the order of St. Augustine,

hath been the first to abuse a consecrated nun; which sin would have been in times past so rigorously punished that she would have been buried alive, and thou wouldst have been scourged to death. But so far art thou from correcting thy faults that moreover, shameful to say, thou hast taken her publicly to wife, having contracted with her an incestuous marriage and abused the poor and miserable . . . to the great scandal of the world the reproach and opprobrium of thy country, the contempt of holy matrimony, and the great dishonor and injury of the vows made to God. Finally, what is still more detestable, instead of being cast down and overwhelmed with grief and confusion, as thou oughtest to be, at thy incestuous marriage, O miserable wretch, thou makest a boast of it; and instead of asking forgiveness for thy unfortunate crime, thou dost incite all debauched religious followers, by thy letters and thy writings, to do the same" (In Horim, p. 299).

Erasmus thus wrote to Luther: "All good people lament and groan over the fatal schism with which thou shakest the world by thy arrogant, unbridled, and seditious spirit" (Epistle to Luther, 1526).

The same learned writer again said: "Luther begins to be no longer pleasing to his disciples, so much so that they treat him as a heretic and affirm that being void of the spirit of the gospel, he is delivered over to the delusions of a worldly spirit" (Epistle to Cardinal Sadolet, 1528).

Calvin wrote thus: "Luther is extremely corrupt. Would to God he had taken pains to put more restraint upon that intemperance which rages in every part of him. Would to God he had been attentive to discover his vices" (Cited by Conrad Schlussemberg).

Again says Calvin: "Luther had done nothing to any purpose . . . that people ought not to let themselves be duped by following his steps and being half-papist; that it is much better to build a church entirely afresh" (In Admon, de lib, Concord. vi).

Sometimes, it is true, Calvin praised Luther so far as to call

him the "Restorer of Christianity." He protested, however, against their honoring him with the name of Elias. His disciples afterwards made the same pretensions. "Those," said they, "who put Luther in the rank of the prophets and constitute his writings the rule of the Church, have deserved exceedingly ill of the Church of Christ and expose themselves and their churches to the ridicule and cutting reproaches of their adversaries" (Florimond, p. 887).

"Thy school," replied Calvin to Westphal, a disciple of Luther, "is nothing but a stinking pig-sty . . . Dost thou hear me, thou dog? dost thou hear me thou madman? dost thou hear me thou huge beast?"

As an indication of the spirituality of Luther's mind it may be remembered that he had a very strong belief in the devil, and claimed to have had a protracted visit from his Satanic Majesty, who gave a long discourse upon the celebration of the mass, and discussed several of the sacraments of the Church. Luther reported the devil's remarks in full, but the teachings of the august gentleman from below possess not much of interest for a majority of minds. It is to be feared there was some defect in the medium, for unless the evil one has been greatly misrepresented, he is capable, at least, of making himself interesting, if not instructive. From Luther's own statement he was sometimes annoyed by the prolonged visits of the gentleman from the domains of sulphur, and he did not find it easy to induce his intruder to take his departure. On one occasion he stated he was under the necessity of throwing his inkstand at the devil's head, but he failed to state whether he hit the mark, and whether any serious damage was inflicted.

Luther's conception of theology was more acute than of science; he believed much stronger in the intricacies and mysteries of theology than in the plainer and more palpable truth of actual knowledge. It must be held to his discredit that he took a positive stand in opposition to the discoveries of the astronomer Copernicus, who taught the new doctrine that the earth was not the centre of the universe, and that the sun

and all the stars revolved around it, but that the sun is in the centre of our system, and that the earth and all the other planets move in regular orbits around it. Luther denounced Copernicus as an "upstart astrologer and a fool who wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy." The great theological controversialist thus proved himself, like thousands of others, unable to grasp the truths which presented themselves so strongly to the mind of the more philosophic Copernicus. Luther saw that the new theory contradicted the teachings of the Bible, and he could not think of tolerating anything that disproved the truthfulness of that ancient volume.

In closing, and to give the reader an idea of the state of mind in which our hero departed this life, a quotation will be given from "Plain Talk About Protestantism of To-day," by Mr. Segur: "Martin Luther despaired of the salvation of his soul. Shortly before his death, his concubine [his wife] pointed to the brilliancy of the stars of the firmament; 'See, Martin, how beautiful that heaven is.' 'It does not shine in our behalf,' replied the master, moodily. 'Is it because we have broken our vows?' resumed Kate, in dismay. 'Maybe,' said Luther. 'If so, let us go back.' 'Too late; the hearse is stuck in the mire,' and he would hear no more. At Eisleben, on the day previous to that on which he was stricken with apoplexy, he remarked to his friends: 'I have almost lost sight of the Christ, tossed as I am by these waves of despair which overwhelm me; and, after a while, he continued: 'I, who have imparted salvation to so many, cannot save myself.' . . . He died, forlorn of God, blaspheming to the very end."

JOHN CALVIN.

Calvin was born July 10, 1509, in Noyon, in Picardy, France. His father, Gerard Chauvin, was a notary-apostolic and procurator-fiscal for the lordship of Noyon, besides holding other offices in the diocese. John Latinized the name of his father to Calvinus, and hence Calvin. It was also written in half a dozen other ways. His mother was Jeanne Lefranc, the daughter of an inn-keeper.

Of Calvin's early years comparatively little is known. His father destined him for theological studies, as, in his boyhood, he showed a tendency for that kind of pursuit. In John's thirteenth year his father procured a situation for him in the household of a nobleman, De Montmor, where he received his education along with the children of the house. On account of the visitation of the plague at Noyon, the nobleman's children were sent to Paris, and thither Calvin accompanied them, and there he received excellent advantages for acquiring an education. He distinguished himself as a studious scholar, and his acquisitions of knowledge were worthy of remark; and to him was accorded skill and acumen as a reasoner.

Intensely devoted to study, he cared little for the pastimes in which his fellow-students indulged. He shunned society, and often censured the frivolities of those around him. It will thus be seen that in early life there was in his manner and character a foreshadowing of the sour, taciturn disposition for which he was noted in maturer years. In his nineteenth year he obtained the living of Marteville. After filling this preferment for two years, he became cure of Pont l'Eveque, a village near the place of his birth. By advice of his father, and in keeping with his own preference, he resigned the cure-

ship to apply himself to legal studies. On this new pursuit Calvin entered with his characteristic ardor, and such was his progress in legal knowledge that he frequently occupied the chair of the professor, while his general reputation for ability and scholarship stood so high that, on leaving Orleans, he received the grade of doctor, as a compliment, and without the usual fees being required of him.

From Orleans Calvin went to Bourges to prosecute his studies under a learned Italian, Alciati, who was a professor of law in the university at the latter place. There he became acquainted with Melchior Volmar, a German, professor of Greek, in the same university at Bourges—a man of sound erudition and good moral character. Calvin took lessons from him in Greek, and was induced to study the New Testament in its original language.

While this was taking place, the Reformation was in active operation in Germany, Luther having some ten years earlier published his thesis against the indulgences of Leo X. In France there had not been as yet any overt revolt against the Church of Rome; but multitudes were lending a friendly ear to the reformed doctrines, and some were, in secret, heartily rejoicing at having embraced them. To such Calvin united himself while at Orleans, and after his removal to Bourges he became a teacher, both in private conference with inquirers, and by discourse in public assemblies. His time was spent in study, in teaching, and consultation.

His residence at Bourges was cut short by the sudden death of his father, which led to his return to his native village, where he remained two years, after which he removed to Paris, where he seems to have resided some three years. He lodged with a friend, Etienne de la Forge, who early became an advocate of reform views; and at his house often visited those who held similar views; and there Calvin saw and conversed with them, and frequently preached in their assemblies. He became thoroughly imbued with the spirit of church reform, and decided to relinquish his legal pursuits and devote himself to theology.

By this time the Reformation had attracted so many adherents in France that the upholders of the Roman Church became alarmed and exasperated, and attempted, as was the custom of the Church, to check the spread of heresy by the most cruel persecutions. It was while these severe measures were being prosecuted that Calvin issued his first publication, an edition of Seneca's Tract, *De Clementia*, with an elaborate commentary. It has been suggested that Calvin's object in publishing this work was to influence the king to put a stop to the persecutions of the heretics who protested against the Romish Church; but there are no proofs that he was actuated by such a motive. The enterprise of publishing the little volume did not prove remunerative, and he was forced to dispose of the limited patrimony left him by his father. He had now reached his twenty-fourth year, and was already the recognized leader of the reform movement in France. He prepared an address, which was delivered by Nicholas Cop in the church of the Maturins on the feast of All Saints; and it was so far a defense of the views of the reformers, especially of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, as to give serious offense to the adherents of the Romish Church. An attempt was made to seize Calvin, but being forewarned of the designs upon him, he made his escape. His lodgings, however, were searched, and his books and papers seized, to the imminent peril of his personal friends, whose private letters were found in his repositories. He retired to the castle of Lord de Hazeville, near Mantes, and afterward to Saintonge, where he was the guest of Louis du Tillet, a canon of Angoulême, and where, at the request of his host, he prepared some short discourses, which were circulated in the surrounding parishes and read in public assemblies. He afterwards removed to Nerac. Here he became acquainted with the venerable Jacques Lefevre d'Estaples, a scholar and man of science whom the queen had rescued from the fury of the Sorbonnists, and engaged as tutor to her children. By him Calvin was warmly received, and his future eminence, as a reformer of the Church, predicted.

He remained here but a few months, when he revisited his native place, after which he again went to Paris, where he took the precaution to keep himself concealed in consequence of the enmity of the Church against the reformers. At considerable risk, however, he came forth to meet one whom he was afterwards to encounter under very different circumstances—the Spanish physician, Servede, or Servetus, who was even then engaged in propagating his heretical views respecting the Trinity. He did not believe that Jesus was God Almighty, creator of heaven and earth. Servetus wished to see Calvin, and a meeting was arranged; but Servetus failed to present himself at the place appointed; it is claimed by some from a repugnance that he felt towards Calvin.

He again found it necessary to quit Paris and betake himself to Orleans. He stopped at Poitiers on his way, and here many, anxious for instruction, gathered around him, and in a grotto near the town he celebrated the communion in the Evangelical Church of France, using a rock as a table. From this time forward his influence increased rapidly, and all who had adopted the views of the reformers looked to him as their leader. But the opposition which was raised against him on the part of the Church to which he had become reprobate, again obliged him to resort to flight, and he made his way to Basel, Switzerland. Here he was welcomed by a band of scholars and theologians. Here he applied himself to the study of Hebrew.

Soon after this he prepared for the press his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, which he published as a confession of the reformed faith. It was published anonymously, Calvin, doubtless, being timid about having it appear in his name. It consisted originally of six chapters, but was subsequently enlarged, and several editions in Latin, French, and other languages were published. This work of Calvin has been severely criticised, and his *Five Points* have been subjected to much animadversion by those who dissent from him, but his convictions were early formed and were not afterwards materially changed. He was but twenty-five years of

age when he wrote the work. A eulogist of Calvin has declared that the history of literature presents no instance of a work written at so early an age which has exercised so powerful an influence upon the opinions and practices of both contemporaries and posterity.

After a visit to France he proposed to return to Basel and continue his studies, but difficulties arising to prevent this he visited Geneva. Here the ardent Farel induced him to remain. He was very soon appointed teacher of theology. He was also elected preacher by the magistrates by the consent of the people, but this office he would not accept till it was repeatedly urged upon him. He was then in his twenty-eighth year. Here with a brief interval he remained during his life, and here a theocracy was established of which he became the head. Farel and Calvin drew up a condensed statement of Christian doctrines consisting of twenty-one articles. This the populace were all required to subscribe to and they were summoned in parties of ten each to formally perform the ceremony. This was liberty of conscience from Calvin's point of view, and he established a rule over his followers as arbitrary as that pursued by the Church he protested against. He favored general education but insisted that religious culture should form a striking feature in the schools, and for this purpose he drew up an elementary catechism from which children were to learn his system of theology while acquiring knowledge of the ordinary secular branches of learning.

A class of dissenters caused Calvin not a little trouble, and these were the Anabaptists, but these Calvin and his colleagues silenced by their authority as well as argumentative disputation. He was instrumental in causing the banishment of Peter Caroli, a preacher who persistently disagreed with Calvin. In a synod held at Bern the differences were discussed. The decision was rendered in favor of Calvin and his friends, while Caroli was deposed from the office he held and compelled to leave the country. Calvin was austure in his manner and he assumed to dictate to the citizens of Geneva as to

what they should believe and how they should conduct themselves in all the minutiæ of life. He laid down rules as to the manner in which garments should be cut and worn, how the beard should be trimmed, and so forth. The tyranny which was thus aimed to be fastened upon the people raised a strong opposition, and Calvin and his friends refused to administer the sacrament to the people, and for this they were indignantly banished from the city. They went first to Bern, and afterwards to Zurich, where a synod of the Swiss pastors had been convened. Before this assembly they pleaded their cause, and many points pertaining to clerical government, sacraments, holidays, observances, and so forth, were fully discussed. Upon a compromise being effected the synod interceded with the Genevese to restore their pastors, but through the Bernese this was frustrated, and a second edict of banishment was the only response.

Calvin and Farel betook themselves to Basel, where they soon afterwards separated, Farel to go to Neufchatel, and Calvin to Strasburg, where he resided till the summer of 1541, occupying himself in literary occupations, as a preacher, and as a lecturer on theology. In 1539 he attended the convention at Frankfort; in the following year that of Hagenau and Worms, as a delegate from the city of Strasburg. He was present, also, at the diet of Ratisbon, where he made the acquaintance of Melancthon, and where a friendship was formed which continued many years.

While he was a resident of Strasburg he found time, besides all his theological labors, to give some attention to the softer sentiments of the heart. It was there he married Idelette de Bures, or Van Buren, the widow of a person named Störder, whom he had converted from Anabaptism. It seems he lived happily with his wife, and he spoke kindly of her after her death, which took place some eight years after their marriage.

Disorder and contention seemed to prevail at Geneva after his departure, and an effort was being made to reëstablish there the rule of the Romish Church. Calvin had regularly

written to his friends in Geneva, and they continued to regard him with affection. In the summer of 1541 the decree of banishment was evoked, and he was invited to return to Geneva, where he was received with enthusiasm. He entered upon the work of reconstruction with characteristic firmness, and he soon became little short of a theological dictator. His simple word was law. He was kept very busy; his duties increased upon him, and he found very little leisure for any purpose save his theological and dictatorial pursuits.

Of the controversies in which Calvin embarked, one of the most important was that in which he defended his doctrine concerning predestination and election. His first antagonist was Pighius, a Romanist, who had also discoursed with Luther and Erasmus on the freedom of the will. He violently attacked Calvin, and the latter replied in a work published in 1543, defending his opinions at length by general reasoning, as well as by appeal to the early Fathers, especially Augustine, who was his favorite authority.

His next conspicuous controversy was with Bolsec, originally a Carmelite friar, but who, having renounced Romanism, had fled from France and come to Geneva, where he appeared as a physician. He had not, however, relinquished theological studies; and being a zealous opponent of predestinarian views, he was induced, on one occasion, after a sermon on this subject by Calvin, to warmly attack him in the public assembly. Calvin replied with great vehemence, and a police officer present thought it scandalous that such scenes should occur in church, and took Bolsec into custody. The pastors resolved to have a conference with him before the council; and for two days the discussion was conducted with much ability and warmth. Calvin's style was imperious and overbearing; he was impatient of opposition. The council was at a loss what course to pursue. Their sympathies were, of course, on the side of their favorite, Calvin, who claimed that Bolsec should be punished for his heresy. The question was submitted to the Swiss churches, but they, also, were divided as to what measures should be taken with the opponent of Calvin.

Some advocated extreme severity, and others advised gentler means. Calvin was understood to be on the side of severity; but, as a compromise, Bolsec was banished from Geneva. Such an outspoken, independent thinker could not be tolerated there.

Not long after this the most memorable of all of Calvin's controversies, and one which piled a load of deep disgrace upon him, was that of the Spanish physician, Michael Servetus. After many weary wanderings, and after having been condemned to death for heresy at Vienne, he was fortunate enough to make his escape to Geneva for protection, where he arrived in July, 1553. The hunted physician remained in quiet; he obtruded not his views upon the public and sought retirement rather than public attention. He was about to leave for Zurich when Calvin sought him out—hunted him down—and caused him to be arrested and conveyed to prison on a charge of blasphemy. This charge was founded solely on certain passages in a work by Servetus, entitled *Christianismi Restitutio*, published in 1553, in which he disagreed with the doctrine of the Trinity, and was what would now doubtless be termed a Unitarian. It was also claimed that passages in his book savored somewhat of Pantheism. This heinous heresy was more than could be brooked by the imperious and persecuting Calvin. At the trial Calvin appeared as accuser, prosecutor, and judge, and the conflict was conducted with ability and bitterness on either side, for Servetus, as well as Calvin, was a man of decided talent. One was contending for his life, and the other to send his antagonist to his death. Calvin had all the advantages on his side; he was on his own domain, and commanded the situation. The court was under his control and a conviction was a foregone conclusion. Sentence of death was passed against the amiable and learned Servetus, who, like a dove hunted by hawks, fled to the nest of a vulture for safety. For the dire offense of giving utterance to his honest convictions, this learned man, at the instigation of the founder of a new and better system of faith, was condemned to be burnt to death with slow fire. This

terrible sentence was carried out on the twenty-seventh of October, 1553. The fire was made of green oak and burned very slowly, so that the wretched sufferer was doomed several hours to unnecessarily endure the agony of the most cruel torture. The poor man's cries and shrieks were most pitiful and would have touched any hearts not of stone. He begged for a speedy death, and that his torments might be over, but this most reasonable request was not granted. The dull oak fire was allowed to be as slow as it pleased, while the vast concourse of Calvinistic Christians viewed the horrid scene with approval.

The fact about this infernal business, which eternally blackens Calvin's character, is that he procured the arrest of Servetus in France, and it was by his instigation and by his turning informer that Servetus was arrested and tried at Vienne. The work of Servetus was published anonymously, but he sent a copy of it to Calvin for his inspection. This Calvin basely caused to be conveyed to the archbishop at Vienne with the suggestion that Servetus be brought to trial. The physician only escaped the toils of his enemies at Vienne to fall completely under the power of worse enemies in Geneva. On the morning of the execution Servetus asked for an interview with his persecutor, and begged his pardon for any wrong he had done him. Calvin was, as ever, unforgiving and relentless; the doomed man was compelled to suffer the agonies of a hundred deaths, while Calvin, the author of the "five points," and the father of the Presbyterian Church, gloried in the sweet satisfaction of revenge.

It relieves Calvin of none of the odium and disgrace resting upon his name that the bloodthirsty cruelty which he visited upon Servetus was approved afterwards by his compeer in Protestantism, Melanethon, as well as by Beza, Farel, Bucer, Occolampadius, Zuingli, Viret, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, Turretin, and hundreds of Calvinistic theologians of later date, who, in their desire to vindicate their great captain, have shown their readiness to apologize for one of the most damnable wrongs against a fellow-man that the tyrants

and despots of the earth have ever committed. It is a terrible commentary on the improved religion which they claimed to establish, that they should under any circumstance be in favor of burning people to death for holding opinions not like their own. It is not a sufficient excuse for them that they had seceded from the mother Church. The child is no better than the parent. And it was not till the higher and nobler influences of civilization had time to produce their better results that the desire to burn those who did not graduate their faith according to the Genevan standard left the hearts of the admirers of Calvin.

The meanness and inhumanity in causing the execution of the poet, James Gruet, for the slight offense he fancied the unfortunate man had committed in relation to himself was of the most relentless and murderous character, the details of which will be given further on.

After this, Calvin had some minor disputes with the followers of Luther respecting the Lord's Supper, which ended in the separation of the evangelical party into two great sections, the former of which held that in the eucharist the body and blood of Christ are objectively and consubstantially present, and so are actually partaken of by the communicants, whilst the latter maintained that there is only a virtual presence of the body and blood of Christ, and consequently only a spiritual participation thereof through faith. These controversies ultimately annoyed Calvin not a little. His system was so thoroughly a tyrannical theocracy that almost every member of the State was under the authority of the Church. His attempts to carry out these views brought him into collision with the authorities and the populace, the latter being enraged at the restraints unnecessarily imposed upon them. His dauntless will and obstinacy prevailed over all opposition, and before he died he had the satisfaction of seeing his favorite system of church polity firmly established, not only at Geneva, but in other parts of Switzerland, and of knowing that it had been adopted by his partisans in France and Scotland.

In the early part of the year 1564 his health which long had been feeble broke down, and his sufferings became so severe that it was easy to perceive that his life was drawing to a close. Among the ailments which afflicted him were fever, asthma, stone, and gout, and from these his afflictions were great. On the sixth of February of the year named he preached his last sermon, having with difficulty found breath to carry him through it. He died on the twenty-seventh of the following May, in the fifty-fifth year of his age.

He was of middle stature; his complexion was pallid and dark; his eye clear and lustrous. He took but little sleep, and was capable of extraordinary effort. His memory was remarkable; he was regarded as a fine logician, his reasoning powers being seldom excelled. He was severe and irritable, harsh and unyielding toward his enemies, but faithful to his friends. He was doubtless a sincere man, but was harsh and cruel in his nature, and his religion conformed to it. He possessed virtues, but his vices were far too conspicuous.

Most of the foregoing is taken from Protestant sources; a desire was felt by the writers to give as favorable a description of the great reformer as possible. It is but fair to give equal space to those who look upon his character and his acts in a different light. We will quote from archbishop Spalding (Hist. Protest. Reformation, p. 373).

"He [Calvin] was as cool and calculating as he was active. He seldom failed, by one means or another, to put down an enemy—every opponent was *his* enemy—because he could seldom be taken at a disadvantage. His vigilance detected their plans, and his prompt activity generally thwarted them. Though very irritable and inexorable in his anger, yet his passion did not cloud his understanding, nor hinder the carrying out of his deliberate purpose. In temperament he was cold and repulsive, even sour and morose. He mingled little with others, and was as reserved in his conversation as he was fond of retirement and study.

"If he had any heart, he never gave evidence of the fact by the manifestation of feeling. At the death of his first and only

child he appears to have shed not one tear. In a letter to the minister Viret, he coldly informed him of the fact, and invited him to pay him a visit at Strasburg, telling him, as an inducement to come, that they 'could enjoy themselves, and talk together for half a day.' He never manifested the least sympathy for those in distress, though in many cases he was himself the cause of their sufferings. Thus, when Servetus, on hearing that he was condemned to the stake, gave way to his feelings in a burst of agony and tears, Calvin mocked at his distress by writing to one of his friends 'that he bellowed after the manner of a Spaniard—mercy, mercy!'

"Thus also when Castalio, one of the most excellent men and accomplished scholars of his age, was on the very verge of starvation, at Berne, whither he had repaired to escape Calvin's persecution at Geneva, the reformer had the cold-heartedness to remind him that he had fed at his table in Strasburg; and to do away with the effect of Castalio's arguments, which he found it difficult to answer, he even accused him of theft. To the first charge Castalio answered, 'I lodged with you, it is true, about a week, but I paid you for what I had eaten. How cordially you and Beza hate me.' The charge of theft he indignantly repelled as follows: 'And who told that? Your spies have deceived you. Reduced to the most frightful misery . . . I took a hook and went to gather the wood which floated upon the Rhine, which belonged to no one, and which I fished up and burnt afterwards at my house to warm myself. Do you call this theft?' Castalio, thus hunted down by his inexorable enemy, literally died of hunger, while struggling to maintain by his learning a wife and eight children. But he had the misfortune to differ with Calvin on predestination while at Geneva, and the boldness to reprove him and his colleagues with an intolerant spirit: 'Paul,' he had told them, 'chastised himself; you torment others.'

"Calvin's personal appearance was an index to his character. He was of middle height, of a lean and supple figure, with a contracted chest, with the veins of his neck full and

prominent, his mouth well made and large, his lips bluish, his forehead expanded, bony, and furrowed with wrinkles, his eye restless, and when he was excited, darting fire. His ceaseless labors caused him to become prematurely gray, and gave him a pale and cadaverous aspect. He was a man from whose appearance you would expect little that was not the result of hard labor.

"What a contrast between him and Luther; Luther a creature of impulse, a portly ex-friar, fond of good cheer, and never more at home than when conversing with his boon companions at his favorite resort, the Black Eagle tavern: Calvin, meagre, silent, and morose, shut up within himself, chilling all with his reserve—all head and no heart. In the pulpit the difference was equally marked. Luther spoke extemporaneously, and without method or choice of words, bore down all before him by a torrent of passionate invective, or boistrous declamation. Calvin was cold and unimpassioned, his diction was pure and polished, his thoughts clear and precise, and his whole manner calculated to make a more deep and lasting impression on his hearers. Calvin's was the eloquence of the head, Luther's that of the heart.

"But they agreed on one thing, if in little else; they both crushed the liberties of the people of the countries which were the respective theatres of their labors. Their profession of breaking the bonds of religious slavery, and of securing political freedom to the people, was all mere talk. It is too late in the day to hold them up as the champions of popular rights. The effect of the Reformation, both at Wittenburg and at Geneva, was obviously to weaken the democratic principle; in both places the rights of the lower orders were ruthlessly trampled under foot. In Germany Luther conjured up a storm which he could not control. We have already shown how he first stirred up the people to revolt, and then clamored for their blood, and how completely he succeeded in destroying their liberties. Calvin also crushed the liberties of the people, but in a more insidious manner; he robbed them of their liberty in the name of *liberty*. A foreigner, he

insinuated himself into Geneva, and, serpent-like, he coiled himself around the very heart of the republic which had given him hospitable shelter, and had adopted him, nor did he relax his hold as long as he lived. He thus stung the very bosom which had warmed him. That this language is not too strong, the following plain statement of facts will sufficiently show:

"The cantons of Switzerland formed one of the many republics of the middle ages. They owed all their liberties, and even their very existence as a distinct government, to Catholics in Catholic times. William Tell, Melchtal, and Furst were the fathers of Swiss liberty. In 1307 was fought by these heroes the famous battle of Morgarten, which drove the Austrians from Switzerland, and secured Swiss independence. The bishops of Geneva had been its earliest and greatest benefactors. They had more than once protected the rights of the city against the aggressions of the dukes of Savoy themselves. One of them—Adhemar Fabri—as early as 1387, had written out the laws and privileges of the city; and the book was venerated as containing the Magna Charta of Genevan liberties. Those laws provided that the citizens had the sole right of inflicting capital punishment; that none should be tortured without the consent of the people; that, from the rising to the setting of the sun, the citizens were the sole guardians of the city, that no agent of the duke or bishop could exercise any power during that time, and that the citizens alone had the right to elect their burgomasters.

"Calvin soon trampled upon every one of these cherished popular privileges. At the instigation of the ministers Farel and Froment, Geneva had already cast off the mild yoke of her episcopal court. Instead of it she was doomed to wear, firmly riveted on her neck, the iron yoke of Calvin's consistory. This spiritual court of Calvin's devising gradually monopolized all power in Geneva. The hitherto free council of the burgomasters became a mere tool in his hands. With its manifold appliances of preachers, elders, and spies, it penetrated everywhere, and struck terror into

every bosom. The pulpit was then a powerful instrument in the hands of the police. Every one trembled at the denunciation of the ministers, for it was almost sure to be followed by ulterior consequences in the social and civil order."

After giving many details of Calvin's system of espionage, prosecutions for trivial offenses, of his suspicious character, and of his severity towards his victims, the archbishop continues as follows (p. 381): "Whosoever opposed Calvin, whether in religion or politics, was hunted down, and his blood was sought at his instigation. He never forgave a personal injury. In regard to his enemies he was as watchful as a tiger preparing to pounce upon its prey, and as treacherous. This is strong language; but it is more than justified by the official records of Geneva. We will present a few of the more striking facts in confirmation of our statement. How sanguinary, for instance, is the spirit breathed in this extract of Calvin's letter to the Marquis de Pouet:

"'Do not hesitate to rid the country of those fanatical fellows (faquins), who, in their conversation, seek to excite the people against us, who blacken our conduct, and would fain make our belief pass as a revery; *such monsters ought to be strangled*, AS I DID IN THE EXECUTION OF MICHAEL SERVETUS'" (Audin, vol. ii, p. 171).

"His vindictive conduct towards Pierre Ameaux, a member of the Genevan council of twenty-five, is a fit commentary on this sentiment. At a supper, this man, inflamed with wine, had said some hard things of Calvin. At his table, another man, Henry de la Mar, had also said, amidst the general applause of the guests, that 'Calvin was a spiteful and vindictive man, who never pardoned any one against whom he had a grudge.' The next morning Ameaux was cited before the council, where he excused himself on the ground that he was excited with wine. The council fined him thirty thalers —a large sum at that time. On hearing of this sentence, Calvin arose, donned his doctor's dress, and, escorted by the ministers and elders, penetrated into the hall of the council and demanded justice in the name of that God whom Pierre

Ameaux had outraged, in the name of the morals he had sullied, and of the laws he had violated; and declared that he would quit Geneva if the man were not compelled to make the amend honorable—a public apology, bareheaded, at the city hotel and in two other places. The council yielded; and the next day, Ameaux, half-naked, with a torch in his hand, accused himself, in a loud voice, of having knowingly and wickedly offended God, and begged pardon of his fellow-citizens' (Audin). What is to be thought of a man who could thus crush a penitent and stricken enemy? Had he aught of the spirit of that God-man who 'would not break the bruised reed?'

"Henry de la Mar, the other culprit, did not escape. He was dogged by Texier, one of Calvin's spies, who extracted from his lips, under an oath of secrecy, some words disrespectful to his master. Texier came running to Calvin with the news, saying he did not think himself bound by his oath when the public good required the disclosure. Calvin accused La Mar, caused him to lose his situation, and had him condemned to prison for three days. The judges assigned for their reason 'that he had blamed Mr. Calvin' (Audin, vol. ii, p. 184).

"Of a similar character was the prosecution, commenced at the instance of Calvin, against Francis Favre, a veteran soldier of the republic, and a counsellor of the city. He had been at a wedding where they had danced all the evening, and where he was accused, by one of Calvin's spies, of having used seditious language. Among the ten specifications alleged against him were several things he had said against Calvin, and the last and most grievous was that he had, on being conducted to prison, cried out' 'Liberty! Liberty! I would give a thousand dollars to have a general council' (of the burgomasters). He was sentenced to beg pardon publicly. The veteran refused; he was sent to prison for three weeks, and was then liberated only at the instance of a deputation from Berne.

"Calvin also sought the life of Ami Perrin, the captain-

general of Geneva. Perrin's wife had been guilty of dancing on the territory of Berne. Calvin sought to entrap Perrin by means of Megret, one of his hired spies. This miscreant denounced Perrin before the council; and he was, in consequence, thrown into prison. Calvin thirsted for his blood. But the people loved Perrin. The council of the two hundred assembled to try him for his life. A reaction took place; Perrin was about to be liberated, and Megret was openly denounced. At this juncture Calvin entered the council hall. The people received him with cries of 'Death to Calvin!' Calvin waved his hand, addressed them, and calmed their fury; but he barely succeeded by his eloquence in saving his own life' (Ibid, p. 196). 'By his overwhelming influence, Calvin, however, succeeded in having Perrin afterwards tried, when, though his life was spared, he was deprived of the place of captain-general' (Ibid, p. 197).

"In reading these details, we are almost reminded of Marat and Robespierre haranguing the Jacobin clubs during the reign of terror. In fact, Calvin's reign in Geneva was truly a reign of terror; and if during it as much blood did not flow as during the French revolution, it was not, surely, his fault. He combined the cruelty of Danton and Robespierre, with the eloquence of Marat and Mirabeau, though he was much cooler, and, therefore, more successful than any one of them all.

"Who will not be stricken with horror on reading of the cold-blooded cruelty with which he hunted down and compassed the death of poor Gruet, the poet! This unfortunate man was accused of having affixed a placard on Calvin's pulpit, at St. Peter's church, in which the reformer was severely handled. He was apprehended, and his papers were seized. Among these, consisting of nothing but loose sheets, were found some scraps of poetry and other fugitive pieces, which were tortured into heresy and treason. He was plied with torture by Calvin's creature, Colladon, every day for a whole month. They wished him to implicate Favre or Perrin; but though he cried out in agony of torture, 'Finish

me, I beseech you—I am dying,' he remained firm, and would not accuse them. The council pronounced sentence of death upon him. Among the charges against him, the principal were, that he had endeavored to ruin the authority of the consistory; that he had menaced the ministers, and spoken ill of Calvin; and that he had conspired with the king of France against the safety of Calvin and of the State. Gruet died on the scaffold, but Calvin was not yet satisfied; he wished that his writings should be condemned; and he himself drew up a long form of condemnation of them, which was approved by the council. Calvin alone is responsible for the blood of Gruet; it still cries aloud to heaven against him.

"We might exhibit similar hard-heartedness and tyranny in his persecutions of Bolsec, of Gentilis, of Berthillier, and of others; but we are heart-sick of these horrors, and must hasten on. Yet we cannot wholly pass over the well-known case of Servetus, to which Audin devotes two whole chapters (Audin vol. ii, chap. xi. and xii, p. 258 to 324), and upon which he sheds much additional light. We will state only a few undoubted and prominent facts in this sad affair.

"1st. Servetus was burnt on the twenty-seventh of October, 1553; but as early as 1546—seven years previously— Calvin had thirsted for his blood, as appears from these words taken from his famous letter to Farel, written in that year: 'If he (Servetus) come here (to Geneva), and my authority be considered, I will not permit him to escape with his life.'

"2nd. Pursuing this bloodthirsty purpose, he had denounced Servetus to the police of Lyons, where he then was. And when he (Servetus) had fled to Vienne he very narrowly escaped—probably with the connivance of the Catholic clergy of Vienne—from the prison to which he had been consigned, at the instigation of officers sent in quest of him, in consequence of his denunciation by Calvin's agents, at Lyons.

"3d. When Servetus, fleeing from his enemies, passed through Geneva, Calvin denounced him and had him arrested, against all the laws of both God and man. For Servetus was

a stranger, only passing through Geneva; and he was not responsible to the Genevan tribunals for a crime which he had not committed within the Genevan territory; and this, even supposing heresy to be a crime punishable by the civil laws.

"4th. Though Servetus was a poor stranger, and though he begged for counsel to defend him, that right not denied even to the meanest culprit was refused him at the instance of Calvin.

"5th. After Servetus had lain in prison five weeks, a victim of disease and devoured by vermin, he wrote to the council, stating his situation and begging for a change of linen. The council wished to grant his request, but Calvin opposed it, and he succeeded. Three other letters written during the following week from prison, in which Servetus begged for counsel and asked that the charges against him should be specified and made known to him, were answered by—silence.

"6th. When, on the morning of his execution, Servetus sent for Calvin and begged his pardon, if he had offended him, Calvin answered him with cold hearted cruelty. We have seen above how he insulted his tears.

"7th. The heartless cruelty of the minister Farel, who accompanied Servetus to execution, is enough to make one's blood run cold at the bare reading of it.

"8th. The year after the execution of Servetus—1554—Calvin published his famous work on punishing heretics, in which he justified the whole proceeding by the authority of Scripture.

"Was this man sent to reform the Church of God? He was worse than 'the Caliph of Geneva' as Audin calls him—he was a very Nero. Gibbon has well said of this transaction: 'I am more deeply scandalized at the single execution of Servetus than at the hectacombs which have blazed at *autos da fé* of Spain and Portugal."

The archbishop quotes from Hallam the following account of the burning of Servetus: "Servetus having, in 1553, published at Vienne, in Dauphiné, a new treatise called *Christianismi Restitutio*, and escaping from thence, as he vainly hoped,

to the Protestant city of Geneva, became a victim to the bigotry of the magistrates, *instigated by Calvin, who had acquired an immense ascendency over that republic*" (Hist. Literature, vol. i, p. 280). And in a note he brings abundant proof of all this, alleging, among other things, the famous letter of Calvin to Farel, "published," he says, "by Witenbogart (a Protestant), in an ecclesiastical history written in Dutch." In the same note he says: "Servetus, in fact, was burned, not so much for his heresies as for *personal offense he had several years before given to Calvin.* . . . Servetus had, in some printed letters, charged Calvin with many errors, which seems to have *exasperated the great Reformer's temper*, so as to make him resolve on what he afterwards executed. The death of Servetus," he continues, "has, perhaps, as many circumstances of aggravation as any execution for heresy that ever took place. One of these, and among the most striking, is that he was not the subject of Geneva, nor domiciled in the city, nor had the *Christianismi Restitutio* been published there, but at Vienne. According to our laws, and those, I believe, of most civilized nations, he was not amenable to the tribunals of the republic" (Hist. Lit). He concludes the entire account with this sweeping accusation against all the early reformers in regard to intolerance: "Thus, in the second period of the Reformation, *those ominous symptoms, which had appeared in its earliest stage, disunion, virulence, bigotry, intolerance, far from yielding to any benignant influence, grew more inveterate and incurable*" (Hallam's Hist. Lit., vol. i, p. 281).

The archbishop continues: "We think that the above facts make good our assertion that Calvin crushed the liberties of Geneva, political, as well as religious." The following may serve to show us how sincere was his zeal for the salvation of souls:

"The plague broke out in Geneva in 1543. The ministers from the pulpit recommended prayer *once a week*, to avert the scourge, and they appointed the Sunday week next following as the day for administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper with the same intent. The plague continued, and the

ministers hid themselves, though hundreds were calling on them for spiritual succor in their dying moments. The hospital was crowded with the dying. The council of State called on the ministers to send one of their number to assist the dying at the hospital, from which duty, however, they wished to exempt Calvin, . . . and agreed to decide by lot who was to go. One only, Geneston, offered to go, if the lot fell on him. The others 'confessed that God had not yet given them grace to have the strength and courage to go to the hospital.' And 'it was resolved to pray to God to give them more courage for the future.' The result was, that no one went to the hospital except Chatillon, a young French poet, and another Frenchman, who fell a victim to the disease. Were those men true shepherds, or were they only mercenaries? The answer may be found in the tenth chapter of St. John's gospel.

"Calvin's morals have been discussed on both sides. Beza and his other friends have held him up as a model of perfection; others, with Bolsec, have represented him as a monster of impurity and iniquity. The story of his having been guilty of a crime of nameless turpitude at Noyon, though denied by his friends, yet rests upon very respectable authority. Bolsec, a contemporary writer, relates it as certain. Before his work appeared, it had been mentioned by Surius in 1558; by Turbes, who lived in the reign of Francis I.; by Simon Fontana in 1557; by Stapleton in 1558; by La Vacquerie in 1560; by De Mouchi in 1562; by Du Prèau in 1567; and by Whitaker before 1570. The learned and careful Protestant, Galiffe, who had examined most thoroughly the archives of Geneva, uses this very plain language:

"'The history of many of the reformer's colleagues is very scandalous, the details of which cannot enter into a work designed for both sexes.' The same writer tells us 'that most of the facts related by the physician of Lyons (Bolsec) are perfectly true.'"

The accounts of Calvin's death are contradictory. His friends fain would have it that it was peaceful and happy,

but if the facts are given it is evident a different state of things existed. The circumstances of his death and burial, to say the least, were hidden and mysterious. His body was immediately covered and his funeral was hastened; it took place at two o'clock in the afternoon of the same day of the death. Beza, his favorite disciple, thus writes on the subject: "There were many strangers come from a distance who wished greatly to see him, although he was dead, and made instance to that effect. . . . But to obviate all calumnies he was put into the coffin at eight o'clock in the morning, and at two o'clock in the evening was carried in the ordinary manner, as he himself had directed, to the common cemetery, called Plein Palais, without any pomp or parade, where he lies at the present day awaiting the resurrection."

"The 'calumnies' to which Beza refers were probably the public rumors spread through the city regarding the manner of the reformers's death. It was said that every one had been prohibited from entering into his chamber, because the body of the deceased bore traces of a desperate struggle with death, and of a premature decomposition, in which the eye would have seen either visible signs of the divine vengeance, or marks of a shameful disease; and that in consequence a black veil was hastily thrown over the face of the corpse, and that he was interred before the rumor of his death had spread through the city. So fearful were his friends of indiscreet looks."

The mystery, however, seems to have been penetrated by a young student who had visited Geneva to take lessons from Calvin. He penetrated into the chamber of the dying man and he has furnished the following evidence of what he saw on the occasion. It should be borne in mind that he was no enemy, but a partisan of Calvin, and that his testimony was wholly voluntary.

"Calvin, ending his life in despair, died of a most shameful and disgusting disease, which God has threatened to rebellious and accursed reprobates, having first been tortured in the most excruciating manner, and consumed, to which fact I can testify most certainly, for I, being present, saw with my own

eyes his most sad and tragical death — *exitum et exitium.*"

Schlussemberg, a Protestant, thus wrote of the death of Calvin: "Calvin died of scarlet fever, devoured by vermin and eaten up by an ulcerous abcess, the stench from which drove away every person" (Theol. Calvin t. iii, p. 72). Without placing implicit confidence in these statements of Calvin's death, it is easy to see that there was something connected with it that his friends desired should not be known. But for the purposes in hand, his life, his conduct, his deeds, and his belief are of more consequence than the disease of which he died or the manner in which he breathed his last.

The following notes pertaining to the hero of this sketch are selected from Bishop Trevern's work, "An Amicable Discussion of the Church of England and the Reformation in General" (Appendix, p. 52):

"'Calvin, I am aware, is violent and wayward; so much the better; he is the very man to advance our cause.' Thus spoke Wolmar, a German, who had taught Calvin at Bourges, and who, together with Greek and Hebrew, had crammed him with the new doctrines of Germany.

"'Calvin,' said Bucer, 'is a true mad dog. The man is wicked, and he judges of people according as he loves or hates them.'"

"Baudoïn, expressing his disapprobation of the opinions of Bucer and Melancthon, said that he admired their modesty, but that he could not endure Calvin, because he had found him too thirsty for vengeance and blood; *propter nimiam vindictæ et sanguinis sitim.* . . . Baudoin, induced by Cassandre, had renounced the doctrine of Calvin. He was the most learned and renowned lawyer of his time. . . .

"The intolerant and sanguinary spirit of this too celebrated man [Calvin] appears in one of his letters to his friend, the Marquis du Pouet: 'Do not find fault with our ridding the country of these fanatics, who exhort the public by their discourses to bear up against us, who blacken our conduct and wish to make our faith be considered as an idle fancy. Such monsters ought to be suffocated, as happened at the

execution of Michael Servetus, the Spaniard.'" The original of this letter has been preserved in the archives of the Marquis du Montelimart, and Voltaire, in 1772, was permitted to see it. After reading it he wrote upon the margin of the letter these words: "What man was ever more imperious and positive and more divinely infallible than Calvin, against whom the smallest opposition that men dared to make was always a work of Satan, and a crime deserving of fire" (Rousseau).

"By teaching that God was the author of sin, Calvin raised against him all the parties of the reform. The Lutherans of Germany united to refute so horrible a blasphemy. 'This opinion,' said they, 'ought everywhere to be held in horror and execration. It is a stoical madness fatal to morals, monstrous, and blasphemous.'

"'This Calvinistic error is horribly injurious to God, and, of all errors, the most mischievous to mankind. According to this Calvinistic theologian, God would be the most unjust tyrant. It would no longer be the devil, but God himself would be the father of lies'" (Conrad Schlussemb. Calvin Theology, fol. 46).

Heshusius, after exposing the doctrine of the Calvinists, indignantly declares that "they not only transform God into a devil, the very idea of which is horrible, but that they annihilate the merits of Jesus Christ to such a degree that they deserve to be banished forever to the bottom of hell" (Lib de Præsent. Corp Christ).

About 1558 appeared in London a work written, or, at least, approved by the English bishops, against the Calvinistic sect of Puritans. Calvin and Beza are there described as intolerant, proud men, who, by open rebellion against their prince, had founded their gospel and pretended to rule the churches with a more odious tyranny than that with which they had so often reproached the Roman pontiffs. They protest, in the presence of Almighty God, that amongst all the texts of Scripture quoted by Calvin and his disciples in favor of the Church of Geneva as against the Church of

Rome and England, there is not a single one that is not turned to a sense unknown to the Church and to all the Fathers since the time of the apostles. This sentiment is also given: "Happy, a thousand times happy, our island, if neither English or Scot had ever put foot in Geneva, if they had never become acquainted with a single individual of these Genevese doctors" (A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline, by Bishop Bancroft, p. 44).

The partisans of Calvin have attempted—and for his credit it is to be wished they had succeeded in their attempt—to rescue his memory from the crime and disgrace of having the mark of infamy branded upon his shoulder. "What must pass as an indisputable proof of the crimes imputed to Calvin is that, after the accusation had been prepared against him, the Church of Geneva not only did not show the contrary, but did not even contradict the information which Berthelier, commissioned by the persons of the same town, gave at Noyon. This information was signed by the most respectable inhabitants of Noyon, and was drawn up with all the accustomed forms of the law. And in the same information we see that this heresiarch, having been convicted of an abominable sin, which was always punished by fire, the punishment that he had deserved was, at the intercession of the bishop, mitigated into that of the *fleur-de-lis*. . . . Add to this, that Bolesque having given the same information, Berthelier, who was still living in the time of Bolesque, did not contradict it, as, undoubtedly, he would have done had he been able to do so without going against the conviction of his conscience and opposing the public belief. Thus, the silence both of the whole town interested in the affair and also of his secretary is, on this occasion, an infallible proof of the disorders imputed to Calvin" (Cardinal Richelieu, Traite. convert, liv. ii, pp. 319, 320). Bishop Trevern adds: "They were at that time so uncontested that a Catholic writer, speaking of the scandalous life of Calvin, advances as a fact well known in England, that the leader of the Calvinists had been branded with the *fleur-de-lis*, and had fled from his native town; and

that his antagonist, Wittaker, acknowledging the fact, merely replied by the following shameful comparison: 'Calvin has been stigmatized, so has St. Paul, so have others also.'" . .

"Moreover, the Lutherans of Germany equally speak of it as a fact; De Calvini variis flagitiis et sodomiticis libidinibus, ob quas stigma Joannis Calvini dorso impressum fuit a magistratu, sub quo vixit" (Conrad Schlussemb, Calvin Theolog., lib. ii, fol. 12). The infamous crime of which Calvin is here charged, and for which, it is claimed, he was branded as a felon, was sodomy. "And as for the affected silence of Beza, it is replied that the disciple having acquired notoriety by the same crimes and the same heresy as his master, he merits not the confidence of any one on this point."

On the subject of Calvin's death, the bishop quotes the following from James Desmay's (doctor of Sarbonne) "Life of Calvin," published in 1614, which is to be found in the Bibliotheque du Roi: "The dean told me that an old canon, a familiar friend of Calvin's, had formerly related to him the manner in which John Calvin died, and that he had learned it from a man called Petit Jean, who was Calvin's valet and who attended on him to his last expiring breath. This man, after his master's death, left Geneva and went to reside again at Noyon. He related to this canon that Calvin, on his death bed, made much lamentation, and that often times he heard him cry out aloud and bitterly bewail his condition; and that one day he called him and said: 'Go to my study, and bring from such a part the Office of our Lady, according to the use at Noyon.' He went and brought it, and Calvin continued a long time praying to God from this Office. He mentioned that the people of Geneva were unwilling to let many persons visit him in his illness, and said that he labored under many complaints, such as imposthumes, the rash, the piles, the stone, the gravel, the gout, consumption, shortness of breath, and spitting of blood; and he was struck by God, as those of whom the prophet speaks: Tetigit eos in posteriora, opprobrium sempiturnum dedit eis."

The bishop then continues: "This recital agrees with that

of Bolsec, who also cites the testimony of those who attended upon Calvin in his last illness. For, after having spoken of the complaints mentioned by Beza and of the lousy disease about which Beza says nothing, he adds: 'Those who attended upon him to his last breath have testified it. Let Beza, or whoever pleases, deny it; it is, however, clearly proved that he cursed the hour in which he had ever studied and written, while from his ulcers and his whole body proceeded an abominable stench, which rendered him a nuisance to himself and to his domestics, who add, moreover, that this was the reason why he would have no one to go and see him'" (Life of Calvin, Lyons, 1577, translated from the Latin).

In reviewing and commenting upon the character and theological views of Calvin, A. J. Davis, in "The Thinker," page 149, thus expresses himself: "By Calvin's unforgiving instigation, a magistrate was deprived of his office, James Gruet was beheaded, and Servetus was burnt at the stake; all which was congenial, and accorded with the spirit of the religious despot and dogmatist. His power to conceive, construct, concentrate, and press home an argument, was fearfully irresistible. No Goth or Vandal was ever more fearless or heartless in the manifestations of conquering courage and power. There was not a clear breath, a silvery-flowing fountain, a sunny garden-flower, an unclouded day, a strain of music, a flight of untrammelled thought—no, nor the minutest conception of that emparadised existence for all men, so grandly sustained by the soaring epics and spiritual reasonings of the intuitive Greeks, but like a blistering breath from hopeless Hades, a pool of blood from the dying martyr's yawning side, an authoritative and unyielding strain from the stony depths of fate, or like a deathly tremor from the heartless continent of intellectual vastness, so appears the withering, chilling, freezing, blasting, damning theology of John Calvin."

In closing the sketch of this unhappy, and, despite his talents and learning, truly execrable character, it seems fitting to quote some of the scathing criticisms of the man as found in Ingersoll's "Heretics and Heresies." "This man

[Calvin] forged five fetters for the brain. These fetters he called points; that is to say, predestination, particular redemption, total depravity, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of the saints. About the neck of each follower he put a collar bristling with these five points. The presence of all these points on the collar is still the test of orthodoxy in the Church he founded. This man when in the flush of youth was elected to the office of preacher in Geneva. He at once, in union with Farel, drew up a condensed statement of the Presbyterian doctrine, and all the citizens of Geneva, on pain of banishment, were compelled to take an oath that they believed this statement. Of this proceeding Calvin very innocently remarked that it produced great satistisfaction. A man named Caroli had the audacity to dispute with Calvin. For this outrage he was banished.

"To show you what great subjects occupied the attention of Calvin, it is only necessary to state that he furiously discussed the question as to whether the sacramental bread should be leavened or unleavened. He drew up laws regulating the cut of the citizen's clothes and prescribed their diet, and all whose garments were not in the Calvin fashion were refused the sacraments. At last the people, becoming tired of this petty theological tyranny, banished Calvin. In a few years, however, he was recalled and received with great enthusiasm. After this he was supreme, and the will of Calvin became the law of Geneva. Under the benign administration of Calvin James Gruet was beheaded because he had written some profane verses. The slightest word against Calvin or his absurd doctrines was punished as a crime."

After reciting in graphic language the facts in the case of the fleeing of Servetus to Geneva, of his arrest, trial, and execution at the instigation of Calvin, Ingersoll continues:

"Liberty was banished from Geneva, and nothing but Presbyterianism was left. Honor, justice, mercy, reason, and charity were all exiled; but the five points of predestination, particular redemption, irresistible grace, total depravity, and the certain perseverance of the saints remained instead.

Calvin founded a little theocracy in Geneva, modeled after the Old Testament, and succeeded in erecting the most detestable government that ever existed, except the one from which it was copied.

"Against all this intolerance, one man, a minister, raised his voice. The name of this man should never be forgotten. It was Castalio. This brave man had the goodness and the courage to declare the innocence of honest error. He was the first of the so-called reformers to take this noble ground. I wish I had the genius to pay a fitting tribute to his memory. Perhaps it would be impossible to pay him a grander compliment than to say, Castalio was in all things the opposite of Calvin. To plead for the right of individual judgment was considered a crime, and Castalio was driven from Geneva by Calvin. By him he was denounced as a child of the Devil, as a dog of Satan, as a beast from hell, and as one who, by this horrid blasphemy of the innocence of honest error, crucified Christ afresh, and by him he was pursued until rescued by the hand of death.

"Upon the name of Castalio Calvin heaped every epithet, until his malice was satisfied and his imagination exhausted. It is impossible to conceive how human nature can become so frightfully perverted as to pursue a fellow-man with the malignity of a fiend, simply because he is good, just, and generous.

"Calvin was of a pallid, bloodless, complexion, thin, sickly, irritable, gloomy, impatient, egotistic, tyrannical, heartless, and infamous. He was a strange compound of revengeful morality, malicious forgiveness, ferocious charity, egotistic humility, and a kind of hellish justice. In other words, he was as near like the God of the Old Testament as his health permitted.

"The best thing, however, about the Presbyterians of Geneva was that they denied the power of the pope, and the best thing about the pope was that he was not a Presbyterian.

"The doctrines of Calvin spread rapidly and were eagerly accepted by multitudes on the Continent; but Scotland in a

few years became the real fortress of Presbyterianism. The Scotch rivaled the adherents of Calvin, and succeeded in establishing the same kind of theocracy that flourished in Geneva. The clergy took possession and control of everybody and everything. It is impossible to exaggerate the slavery, the mental degradation, the abject superstition, of the people of Scotland during the reign of Presbyterianism. Heretics were hunted and devoured as though they had been wild beasts. The gloomy insanity of Presbyterianism took possession of a great majority of the people. They regarded their ministers as the Jews did Moses and Aaron. They believed they were the special agents of God, and that whatsoever they bound in Scotland would be bound in heaven. There was not one particle of intellectual freedom. No one was allowed to differ from the Church, or to even contradict a priest. Had Presbyterianism maintained its ascendency, Scotland would have been peopled by savages to-day."

In taking leave of this great light of Protestantism, this dictator of belief to more than half of the Protestant Church, it is very clearly seen that he was one of the most despicable and infamous characters that ever disgraced the name of religion. His intolerance, his tyranny, his despotism, and his bloodthirsty cruelty were only limited by the bounds of his power. His murderous executions did not extend beyond Geneva and some of the Swiss cantons, because his domain extended no farther. He crushed the right of opinion as far as possible. He was not the friend of mental liberty. Had his power been as extensive as many of the popes of the Romish Church, he would have ruled with as heavy a hand and with as merciless tyranny as any of the hideous moral monsters treated of in this volume.

LOYOLA AND THE JESUITS.

The first half of the sixteenth century was a period of singular importance in the history of mankind. Luther had begun the German Reformation. Men had begun to look with bitter disgust upon the mendicancy of monks, the vices of the clergy, and the corruptions of the Romish Church. Rome was the spot where all iniquity met and overflowed. Men's eyes were opening. The infancy of the nations of modern Europe was passed. At length the printing press began to multiply the energetic protests against the supremacy of sacerdotal power. There was a sudden burst of light, and the human mind was summoned to new paths. Errors and vain ceremonies were exposed. The free schools of Germany were established; the prerogative of private judgment was growing in favor among the nations of western Europe. Italy and Spain were filled with reformers, and princes and nobles and bishops seemed willing to soften the harsher traits of popish superstition. And now appeared a man whose name is associated with a dark and dreadful society, which, for three centuries, has filled mankind with affright and lead the reactionary movements of the world. An ignorant, wounded, and disheartened Spanish noble and soldier threw aside the rich trappings of his rank, exchanged his costly garments for the rags of a beggar, and as a champion of Mary, queen of heaven, went to Rome, and changed the destiny of Europe and mankind. This was Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus. A dreadful mystery still hangs over this dangerous association. Its rival and once superior brotherhoods have long fallen into obscurity. Inferior orders have risen and sunk within the limits of the Romish faith;

Dominicans and Franciscans, who once strove for the mastery of the Italian councils, are now scarcely heard of, while the Benedictines are almost forgotten on Monte Cassino; but the infamous Jesuits still retain their political power and general renown, still seek to revive the extravagant superstitions of Rome, and denounce, with maledictions and threatenings, the course of modern civilization. The Romish Church has been transformed into the society of Loyola; and it was his fierce genius that presided at that last imperious council at the Vatican, which declared an old and feeble mortal the vice-gerent of God, and threatened with the curse of heaven kings, potentates, or people who refused to submit to his infallible rule.

Don Inigo Lopez de Recalde (the original name of Loyola) was born of a noble family at Loyola Castle, in Biscay, in 1491. His early life was passed in the army, where he served with distinguished bravery. By nature he was of an ardent, imaginative temperament, and in youth was the very prototype of the hero of Cervantes, an enthusiastic votary of chivalrous romance. After signalizing his gallantry in several campaigns, he received, at the seige of Pampeluna, in 1520, a wound which made him a cripple for life. He began to beguile his time with books; and on reading the "Lives of the Saints," his imagination became highly excited, and he determined to devote himself from that time to works of piety. During the tedious confinement which followed his being wounded, his mind was exercised by the mysteries of religion. Ascribing his recovery to a miracle of grace, he dedicated himself to arduous religious enterprises and to the service of the Blessed Virgin. He became a popular preacher, and was renowned for his penances and vigils. In 1523 he performed a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, from which he returned to Spain in 1524. He made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the hope of converting the Infidels who were masters of the Holy Land, or of gaining the palm of martyrdom in the attempt. Having accomplished this painful and perilous journey, he returned to Spain, more unprovided even than he had left it.

This was in 1526. He passed several ensuing years at the universities of Alcala and Salamanca in the study of grammar, philosophy, etc., which he had neglected to learn in his youth. At Alcala he found a few adherents; but his strange conduct caused him to be suspected of witchcraft and imprisoned therefor by the Inquisition. Upon being delivered from the Holy Office in 1528, he went to Paris to continue his studies. He there became acquainted with several Spaniards and Frenchmen, who were afterwards noted as his followers. They were Pierre Favre, Francis Xavier, Lainez, Salmeron, Bobadilla, and Rodriguez. They conceived a plan of an order for the conversion of heathens and sinners, and on Ascension Day, in 1534, they solemnly pledged themselves to this great work in the subterranean chapel of the abbey of Montmartre. They met again, in 1536, at Venice, whence they proceeded to Rome, and received the confirmation of their fraternity from Pope Paul III, as "Clerks of the Society of Jesus."

In 1541 Loyola was chosen general of the society, invested with absolute authority, and subject only to the pope. He thenceforth remained at Rome, and witnessed the extraordinary success of his efforts. "Under his rule," says Macaulay, "the order grew rapidly to the full measure of its gigantic powers. With what vehemence, with what policy, with what exact discipline, with what dauntless courage, with what self-denial, with what unscrupulous laxity and versatility in the choice of means, the Jesuits fought the battles of their Church, is written in every page of the annals of Europe during several generations. In the Order of Jesus was concentrated the quintessence of the Catholic spirit; and the history of the Order of Jesus is the history of the great Catholic reaction. This order possessed itself at once of all the strongholds which command the public mind—of the pulpit, of the press, of the confessional, of the academies. Nor was it less their office to plot against the thrones and lives of apostate kings, to spread evil rumors, to raise tumults, to inflame civil wars, to arm the hand of the assassin."

Loyola continued to exercise the superior and absolute power of the order during life. In the year 1556, a comet of startling magnitude, half as large as the moon, blazed over Europe and filled the uncultivated intellect of the age with dread and expectation. Loyola lay on his dying bed. His life had already become one of the great powers of the earth. His followers were many thousands; and the last injunctions of the soldier-priest were chiefly an inculcation of passive obedience. It is related that he died without receiving the last sacraments of his Church, and that his dying lips uttered only complaints and lamentations.

He was solemnly canonized as a saint by Gregory XV. in 1622. His life has been written in almost every European language. His chief work is "Spiritual Exercises," in which he gives rules and counsels for the guidance of believers. In person, Loyola was of middle stature, and of olive complexion, with a bald head, eyes full of fire, and an aquiline nose, majestic air, and noble countenance. He has been described as a fiery enthusiast, though nothing could be further from the truth. Notwithstanding he was by nature of an ardent temperament his actions were so entirely under his control that during his life he was commonly thought cold and phlegmatic. His outward bearing gave no sign of the religious zeal which burnt in his heart. Obedience, humility, and resignation amounting to indifference, were among the virtues that he practiced and loved to inculcate. To him are due, not alone in the general spirit, but even in most of their details, all the rules and constitutions of his order.

After the death of Loyola, the Society of Jesus was, in a degree, remodeled. Its main object then became to defend the supreme authority of the papacy, and for this purpose to work by good or bad means, as would best effect the downfall of its foes, or the elevation of its friends. It grew rapidly in numbers and wealth. It was linked together by an organization so perfect as to surpass in vigor every other human institution. The whole body was guided by a single will, and the faith in the wildest extravagances of the mediæval

Church was enforced by a long and rigorous education, in which every doubt was heresy, and every impulse of reason was contemned. Its general was supreme; its members saw in him the representative of Deity on earth. At the command of an absolute master, they wandered among the throngs of their fellow-men, eager only to obey his voice. Obedience to the Jesuit has ever been the first principle of his faith, instilled into his mind in youth, perfected by the labors of his later years. He hears in the slightest intimations of his chief at Rome the voice of his God, the commands from heaven, and in the long catalogue of fearful deeds which history ascribes to the disciples of Loyola, the first impulse to crime must always have come from the absolute head of the order, and its single aim has always been to advance the power of the Romish Church.

Scarcely had its founder gained the favor of the pope, and fixed his seat at Rome, when he revived the Inquisition. Italy trembled before the spectacle of ceaseless *autos da fé;* the tortures and the cries of dying heretics, the ruin of countless families, the flight of terrified and hopeless throngs from their native land to the friendly shelter of Germany and Switzerland, were the earliest fruits of the relentless teachings of Loyola. The Jesuits spread from Italy through all the kingdoms of Europe. They ruled in courts; they terrified the people into submission; their schools and colleges spread from Paris to Japan; and they began that wild war between mediæval superstition and advancing civilization which for three centuries has rained waste and ruin upon the human race. They checked forever all hope of change in the Romish Church; with them all was immutable. Just previous to the institution of their society, Germany and France had consented to make such liberal concessions to the Lutherans and Huguenots as might have checked religious dissension and prevented religious wars. But, fierce and irreconcilable, the Jesuits threw themselves into the arena of religious strife, and scattered the brands of discord. But for them the dreadful stains of three centuries of cruel strife might have been

averted. Obeying the voice of Loyola, they offered to the heretic only death or submission. They stimulated kings to persecute reformers, nations to fight for the advancement of the papal rule. They everywhere brought with them their cruel hatred of religious freedom, their cunning, their moral degradation, their bold and desperate policy, and with fierce and intolerant zeal everywhere stifled the voice of humanity and love. At the council of Trent, the last great council that was to assemble for three centuries, the Jesuit Lainez obtained such a mastery over the machinery which was there constructed for the spiritual subjugation of the nations, that from that day they became the real supremacy of the Christian world, and the wildest extravagance of the faith of Loyola was ingrafted forever into the creed of the Romish Church.

From their first institution the Jesuits have made it one of their fundamental maxims not to publish the rules of their order; these they kept concealed from strangers, and did not communicate them to the greater part of their own members. They refused to produce them when required by courts of justice. But during the prosecutions which were carried on against them in Portugal and France, they were finally so inconsiderate as to produce the Monita Secreta, many extracts from which were published in the "British Review," for 1815. By the aid of these authentic records the policy and government of this order have been investigated with a degree of certainty that could not otherwise have been obtained.

In 1755 the English captured a great number of French merchantmen on the high seas, which involved a Marseilles house in enormous bankruptcy. This bankruptcy disclosed the fact that the Marseilles merchants were only factors for one Father Lavelette, in the Antilles, who, under color of the French mission there, was found to have trafficked on a grand scale in the interests of the Jesuit society. It was found impossible for the Jesuits, in this instance, to evade the skill of the French lawyers, who drove them like a fox from covert to covert till they were fairly run down. It was

proved in open court, upon the trial of this celebrated case, that the general of the society was absolute and sole proprietor of all its wealth. This trial led to other civil proceedings against the Jesuits, in which it was legally proved that they are a vast company of conspirators against all other social systems, their own Church not excepted. In 1761 it was proved before the French parliament that the society operates through a vast body of assistants, who know nothing of the secrets of the order, and who can be safely thrown off or disowned as having no part in the same. These associates, then, are at the same time, "not Jesuits," and yet the most mischievous Jesuits for all practical purposes. It was shown that the society is a band of aliens in any country where it exists; owing abject obedience in every particular to their absolute despot at Rome, and having no will but that of their chief. It appears that the Jesuits are exempt from all diocesan authority; no bishop can direct them or call them to account; they are, on the contrary, in every country the spies who make its local bishops tremble before them and execute their pleasure on pain of being denounced at Rome and visited with fearful penalties.

The Roman episcopate is merely the tool of this dangerous society. Since the council of Trent the pontiffs have been to a great extent the creatures of the Jesuits, and almost without exception their tools. The Italians know this so well that they call the general of the Jesuits "The Black Pope," regarding the "White Pope" (Leo XIII., for example) as the mere puppet of his sable brother, who works in the dark, and makes the pasteboard pope perform according to his will. The late deceased pope, Pius IX., after a short struggle to be his own master, was forced to succumb; the policy of the Jesuits triumphed in the last council of the Vatican. Father Beckx, the general of the order, is the infallible autocrat of the Roman Church to-day, and from his retreat at Malta is able to overcome the counsels and the liberties of nations, in proportion as the Romish population is numerous, through the agency of the confessional.

In 1750, Duke Pombal, an able statesman and the prime minister of Portugal, regarding the Jesuits as the origin of the weakness and troubles of the goverment, became a member of their order that he might fathom their secret operations and treachery, and be qualified to counteract their pernicious machinations. With profound dissimulations, he so completely deceived them that they admitted him to an intimate knowledge of all their secrets, plans, and designs. After having fully attained his object he made a public exposition of their secrets. He disclosed the dangerous principles of their constitution, their political intrigues, the oaths by which they were bound, their horrible deeds, and their disgraceful rapacity and profligacy. By the exposure which he was enabled to make they were removed from the important positions of confessors to the king and instructors of youth in colleges. The king, Joseph I., abridged their power, and prohibited the celebration of the *auto da fé* of the Inquisition. They then determined to assassinate the king; but failing in this attempt the whole order fell under the ban of the kingdom, and were officially declared a political organization under the mask of religion, and its members were expelled from the country as enemies of the public peace and traitors to the government.

It appears that the simple and primary design of the Jesuits was to establish a spiritual despotism over the minds of men, of which the pope should appear as the ostensible head, while the real power should be vested in themselves. They had private tokens by which they knew each other; but mingling in all the walks of social life, they were not known to the uninitiated, who were thus surrounded by spies. Monarchs whom they daily approached as confessors were blindly wrought upon to do the will of the dark and dangerous order, and their secret councils were too often betrayed and transmitted to Rome. Every member was at the disposal of the general of the society, who was chosen for life by deputies from the several provinces, and whose power was supreme and independent, extending to every person and every case. By his uncontrollable mandate he could impose any task

upon the members, or employ them in any service. To him each member, the instant he entered the pale of the order, surrendered all freedom of thought and action, and every personal feeling was superseded by the interests of the society to which he had attached himself. He went wherever he was ordered, he performed whatever he was commanded, and became a mere passive instrument, incapable of resistance.

There was not in the annals of mankind an example of such absolute despotism over a large body of men dispersed over the face of the whole earth. In order that the general, who was the soul that moved and animated the whole society, might have under his eye everything necessary to inform or direct them, the provincials and heads of the several houses were obliged to transmit to him regular and frequent reports concerning the members under their inspection. These contained the minutest details with respect to the character, abilities, experience, and shrewdness of each person; and these reports, when digested and arranged, were entered into registers kept for that purpose. With their aid the general might at one comprehensive view survey the state of society in every corner of the earth, and thus choose, with perfect information, the instruments which his absolute power could employ in any service for which he thought proper to commission them. The members were required to act as spies upon the novices and were bound to disclose everything of importance to the superiors. In order that this scrutiny might be as complete as possible, a long novitiate was demanded, and it was only after passing through the several gradations of rank, and after attaining the full age of thirty-three years that any were permitted to take the final vows and become professed members. To guard against undue intimacy or ties of friendship being established between individuals in the order, it was provided by an ordinance of the college of Jesuits, that when three members are walking together, if one of them leaves the other for a moment, the remaining two are obliged to move out of ear-shot, one from the other, until the return of the third. The correspondence

of the Jesuits was wonderfully organized and carried on for the purpose of furnishing the leaders with every sort of information of which they might stand in need; and the superior general daily received a mass of reports bearing mutually on one another. In the central establishment there were kept immense registers, in which were inscribed the names of all Jesuits, of all their outside associates, and of all persons of distinction. In those registers were reported the most minute facts in the life of each individual. It made the most enormous biographical collection that ever has been brought together. When it became expedient to influence any individual, reference was made to the book, and instantly the life, character, friends, projects, and even the most secret connections of the person in question, were laid open. This rendered the order a police, infinitely more exact, and possessing deeper information, than that of any government. We understand from this the full meaning of the Jesuit general who said to the duke of Brissa: "From this chamber, Monsieur, I govern not only Paris, but China; not only China, but the whole world, without any person knowing how this is accomplished." Truly was it said that the society was a sword, the hilt whereof was at Rome; but if the hilt were there, the blade was everywhere, and that with so fine an edge as to make itself felt before it was seen.

Every Jesuit was taught to regard the interests of the society as the capital object, to which all other considerations were to be sacrificed. This spirit of attachment to their order, the most ardent that ever influenced any body of men, was the peculiar characteristic of the Jesuits. This doctrine of passive and absolute obedience was summed up in these terrible words of the dying Loyola: "Every member of the order shall be in the hands of his superiors even as a corpse." They were required to attend to all the transactions of the world, on account of the influence which they might have on religion; they were directed to study the dispositions of persons in high rank, and to cultivate their friendship; and by the very constitution, as well as genius of their order, a spirit

of espionage and intrigue was infused into all its members. There has not been an important affair in any part of the world, where they have not exerted their influence in the most effective manner.

The fundamental principles of this dark and dangerous order, viz., that it is to be perpetuated at the expense of society at large, and that the end sanctifies any means, however bad, are utterly incompatible with the welfare of any government. And consequently we find that nearly all governments, Catholic as well as Protestant, Rome not excepted, have found it necessary for their peace and security to abolish the irrepressible society of Loyola. Almost every land has been imperiled by their intrigues and stained by their crimes; and the sentence of their abolition has been passed by the monarchs and senates and statesmen of all religions, and of almost every civilized country in the world. They were expelled from England in 1604; from Venice in 1606; from Portugal in 1759, with every brand of infamy, upon the charge that certain members of their order had assassinated Joseph I. Malagrida and some of their Fathers were found guilty and condemned to the stake. On the ninth of May, 1764, they were expelled from France by decree of Parliament. Their protector, Clement XIII., died in 1769. France, Spain, Portugal, and Naples insisted on the election of a successor pledged to abolish the society itself, and Ganganelli, though unpledged, was finally elected with good hopes that he would act according to his known convictions. This worthy young man, as Pope Clement XIV., spent four years deliberately examining the history of the infamous order, and in searching the archives of the Propaganda for the documents relating to their missions. All Christendom demanded their suppression. Finally, July 21, 1773, Clement signed the brief for their suppression. This was not issued until he had fully considered the consequences to himself. He sighed as he gave the instrument his signature, saying: "The suppression is accomplished. I do not repent of it, having only resolved on it after examining and weighing everything,

and because I thought it necessary for the Church. If it were not done, I would do it now; but I have signed my own death-warrant." In September, 1774, after many menaces, this prophecy was fulfilled. The initial letters of a pasquinade appeared on St. Peter's church, which he interpreted: "The holy see will be vacant in September," which was verified in his death on the twenty-second of that month, attended with every symptom of poison. No candid student of the facts can doubt that he died by Jesuit hands.

The society survived. After a masked and hidden life for more than forty years, it was openly reinstated by Pius VII. It immediately reëntered on its course of unchanging craft and intrigue; and to-day its general, or "the Black Pope," is the real ruler of the Roman world. Through the present dummy pope on the throne of St. Peter, the disciples of Loyola still proclaim the persecuting doctrines of mediæval Rome, still propagate the intolerant creeds of Pius IV. and Pius V., still excuse the massacre of St. Bartholomew and defend the Inquisition, still defy governments and await the opportunity to destroy all their foes, the chief of whom are the schoolmaster and the printer. They plot and incite the wars against modern civilization, and lead the reactionary movements of the nineteenth century.

From its institution by Loyola to the present time, the Society of Jesus has proved to be the greatest enemy of man. In its inquisitorial, unrelenting pursuit of blood, it has spared neither race nor age, neither thrones nor firesides. The general voice of history arraigns it as the secret source of all the horrors and enormities, tortures and crimes, that the old persecuting power of papal Rome has inflicted on mankind since 1538. This long indictment of blood and misery includes every atrocity of secret assassination and public wholesale slaughter. The tortures and the cries of dying heretics, the ruin of countless families, the flight of terrified and hopeless throngs from their native land to the friendly shelter of Germany and Switzerland, were the earliest fruits of the merciless teachings of Loyola. The Jesuits led the

armies of the persecutors into the beautiful Vaudois valleys, and the worst atrocities of that mournful example of human wickedness are due to their brutal fanaticism. As politicians, they brought war, pestilence, and famine to Germany, destroyed the impulse of reform in France, made Italy and Spain the scoff of nations, led the revolts of Ireland, stimulated the fanaticism of Alva, tormented far-distant China and Abyssinia, assailed Russia, filled England with plots, and taught the Romish Church its policy of persecution and intrigue. They were everywhere the most active of politicians, in wars, civil tumults, in Spanish Armadas and sudden assassinations. It was at the instigation of the Jesuits that Charles V. began the great religious wars which carried desolation and death throughout Germany; that the Protestants of Venice were thrown into the Adriatic; that the terrible Inquisition was renewed with a severity that exceeded all its former cruelties; that the reformers of all lands were dragged forth to the martyrdom of flames: that John Louis Paschal was roasted alive before Pope Pius IV. and his holy college at Rome in 1560; that the Christians of the valleys of Piedmont were put to death with atrocities that seem almost inhuman to remember; some impaled, some burned in a slow fire, some hacked to pieces and their wounds filled with quicklime, some covered with brimstone matches and set on fire, and the mouths of some filled with gunpowder, the explosion of which blew off their heads. It was the Jesuits who urged on the wholesale slaughter of the Huguenots; who were the direct instigators of those fearful wholesale persecutions which depopulated France, under Louis XIV., and by which, in Languedoc alone, one hundred thousand persons perished, of whom ten thousand met death by fire, strangulation, and the rack. It was they who accomplished the assassination of Henry IV. of France, by the dagger of Ravaillac, in 1610; who in 1662, by poisoning Blaise Pascal, put out the most brilliant intellect that ever lighted this world; who in 1709 brought about the destruction of Port Royal, the seat of their adversaries, the Jansenists: who in 1605 concocted the memorable gun-

powder plot, by which the king, queen, and parliament of England were to have been blown up by thirty-six barrels of gunpowder exploded by the match of Guy Fawkes; and who have been, directly or indirectly, at the bottom of nearly all the calamities which their opponents, both Catholic and Protestant, both sovereigns and subjects, have endured since their dark plotting order commenced its career of crime.

The Jesuits, like all the other religious orders, bound themselves by the usual monastic vow of poverty. Publicly abjuring the possession of property as a crime, and professing poverty as a virtue, they clandestinely monopolized the wealth of the world—the domains of princes, the traffic of merchants, and the political power of governments. They excelled all the other mendicant orders in duplicity and rapaciousness. Animated by a crafty and unprincipled zeal for the emolument of their society, they established mission-houses among savage nations, under the pretext of civilizing them and saving their souls. But this specious pretext was but a pious mask, under which was concealed an infamous scheme of swindling the natives abroad out of property, and wheedling the devout at home out of liberal donations and splendid legacies. Pagan simplicity has never been a match for monkish craft; and no sooner had the gold and gems of the natives inflamed the zeal and sharpened the shrewdness of the monks than these were wrung from them by some swindling transaction. They made fortunes out of the devout at home and the savages abroad.

The following transaction illustrates the adroitness of this avaricious sacerdotal order: In the year 1701, eight heavy cases arrived in Cadiz from the Indies, marked *chocolate*. Those who handled this part of the cargo complained that they had never lifted such heavy boxes of chocolate before. They fancied they contained lead instead of an article of diet. This merchandise was consigned, not to a merchant, but to "the Very Reverend the Procureur General of the Society of Jesus, at Madrid." Curiosity was awakened by the extraordinary weight of the cases, and one of them was opened.

Nothing was to be seen but veritable chocolate, in enormous cakes, well packed. Yet the immense weight of the cakes remained to be accounted for. They found the cakes hard to break; but when one yielded to a smart blow, it was found to be solid gold, thinly coated with chocolate. This led to the discovery that the Fathers, under color of their mission, were carrying on a vast trade for the profit of the society, which for a long time had been known to be rich in ready gold, to a degree for which even their known craft and greediness seemed insufficient to account.

At that time Spain swarmed with Jesuits, and they enjoyed the favor of the court; their vast possessions in houses, schools, colleges, and churches were magnificent beyond the splendor of palaces; they lived like princes. They denied all knowledge of the chocolate-coated gold, and were so persistent in their assumed innocence as to suffer its entire confiscation to the royal exchequer. They put up with this enormous loss rather than have their world-wide enterprises exposed and unmasked, They could not afford to let the world know that gain was the secret of their godliness. But underneath their most specious and harmless pretexts, there was sure to be something hidden that was gain to them. Power and wealth were the grand objects of the society; and nothing in the world that might yield them profit in these particulars was left untaxed.

As teachers, the wily Jesuits strove to grasp the complete control of education. They became the most powerful agents in advancing or restoring the declining power of Rome. They have ever denounced as godless and immoral that system of public instruction which in Europe and America has stimulated the progress of industry and of honesty. When Austria secularized her schools, it was considered by the Jesuits and their dummy pope an act of direct rebellion. According to them the State has no business to intermeddle with education. Our own republican school system has evoked their utmost hostility. No school will be approved by them unless it be under the control of Jesuit teachers. Jesuit papers advise

their people not to send their children to our schools, to refuse to pay their school tax, and bishops urge their flocks to prefer ignorance to instruction at the public school. At a Catholic convention held not long since in St. Louis, our free school system was denounced in a resolution as "a curse to the country, and a floodgate of atheism and sensuality." It was there openly proclaimed that the Catholics "stood before the country as enemies of the public school;" and that "they would as soon send their children into a pest house, or bury them, as send them to our present schools." "The New York Tablet," a Jesuit organ, for March 1872, said: "Let schools be modified as they may, they will never serve our purpose unless placed under the control of the Church." The Jesuit press and priests everywhere strive to excite their people to violence against our teachers. The most fiendish and malignant assaults have been the result. Instances are still fresh in the public mind where teachers have been struck down by Jesuit assassins, as at Hunter's Point, and left bleeding and dying in the schoolhouse, as at Centralia. The great conflict of the day is between the pope and the printing press, the Jesuit and the common school. The Catholic crusade of this century is against free education.

The fact is notorious that the Romish Church seeks nothing less than the establishment of Jesuit schools in our country, which shall be maintained from the public treasury. Our large, turbulent, Catholic population, which, as statistics show, furnishes more than three-fourths of our criminals and paupers, is taught by plotting Jesuit priests to hate the teacher and the public school. They would revive in our own favored land the old, happy time, when in Ireland the priest stood in the road and whipped the children who attempted to enter the schoolhouse back to their wretched hovels. They would gladly fill our great American cities with the sloth and vice and degradation that have been expelled from the capitals of the Old World. And our own self-preservation demands that the foreign population in our midst shall submit to have their children pass through the alembic of our

republican schools, and that they shall submit to our American processes provided for their purification and enlightenment. And it should never be forgotten that the securities of our government do not take care of themselves, and that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The warning lesson of history is that wherever popery and Jesuitism has spread, learning has declined. The midnight of the world was when Roman Catholicism flourished in the rankest luxuriance. All through that long and dreary period known as the Dark Ages, in which the lights of science and learning were almost extinguished, the papal Church, as we have seen, exercised supreme dominion, and controlled the civil and educational policy of all nations. Italy, at the time the last census was taken, affords a fair exemplification of the Jesuit system of education. Out of twenty-four million of people, seventeen million were unable to read the letters of the alphabet. To borrow the words of Ingersoll, the Jesuits reduced Spain to a guitar, and Italy to a hand-organ. Says the eloquent and humane Victor Hugo:

"You [Jesuits] claim the liberty to instruct. For some centuries you have held in your hands, at your discretion, at your school, under your ferule, two great nations—Italy and Spain, illustrious among the illustrious; and what have you done with them? I am going to tell you. Thanks to you, Italy, of which no one can think nor even pronounce her name without inexpressible grief—Italy, that mother of genius and of nations, which has diffused over the whole world the most astonishing productions of poetry and art—Italy, which has taught our race to read, does not to-day know how to read herself! Yes. Italy has, of all the States of Europe, the smallest number of native inhabitants who are able to read! Spain, magnificently-endowed Spain, which received from the Romans her first civilization, from the Arabians her second civilization, from Providence, and in spite of you, a world, America; Spain has lost, thanks to you, thanks to your brutal yoke, which is a yoke of degradation, Spain has lost the secret of her power, which she

received from the Romans—that genius in the arts, which she received from the Arabs—that world which God gave her. And in exchange for all that you have made her lose, what has she received? She has received the *Inquisition!* The Inquisition, which has burned upon the funeral pile five millions of men! *Read history!* The Inquisition, which exhumed the dead in order to burn them as heretics. The Inquisition, which declares children heretics even to the second generation. See what you have done with that focus of light which you call Italy!—you have extinguished it. That colossus which you call Spain, you have undermined. The one is in ruins, the other in ashes. See what you have done for these two great nations!"

Our sole and only hope of success against these plotters of iniquity is the general diffusion of education; and, therefore, let public opinion write in Italics upon our Constitution and statute books, "Our common schools, they must and shall be preserved;" and let each and every loyal American swear to cherish and protect them as the apple of his eye. When we calmly reflect upon the Jesuit institution, its infamous career of artifice and crime, the immense treasure and domain it has acquired by trick and treachery; when we call to mind the avarice by which it has been actuated, the duplicity it has practiced; when we consider how utterly regardless of every maxim of justice and every principle of honor it has been; how, with the mailed hand of superstition, and with anathemas more dreaded by the ignorant and degraded than a thousand pistols, it has demanded, like a highwayman, tribute from every one it chanced to meet; it looms up before the imagination as a vast and mysterious corporation of outlaws, whose right is might, whose object is wealth, whose profession is power and pious plunder. It traffics in the hearts and souls of men, sports with their hopes and fears, and makes merchandise of heaven and hell, time and eternity. It rises before the imagination like some black and midnight monster, dripping with human gore, an embodiment of every deformity, an incarnation of every loathsome, hideous, and unsightly

demon, and a just embodiment of the character of the arch-fiend. Wars and revolutions, plots, assassinations, intrigue, moral corruption, and unsparing cruelty have marked its history. They have been driven from Germany, and excluded from Italy, the home and center of popery. But, like a snake in the grass, which escapes destruction by its subtle glidings, this old dragon of popery has artfully succeeded in winding its hideous trail of human misery across the ages, and with its head unbruised, and with its fangs still red with the blood of martyrs, it boldly confronts the European colossus, Bismarck; and not till after the most desperate struggle is it compelled to uncoil its poisonous hold from the German fatherland. Surviving all the assaults of popes and principalities, despite the condemnation of the past and the protest of the advancing civilization, the order of Jesuits is the disturbing element among the nations to-day, and the greatest reproach upon the nineteenth century.

HENRY VIII.

This puissant king of England, head of the house of Tudor, a prince descended from the families of York and Lancaster, and in whom, after torrents of bloodshed, the red and white roses were at length united, was one of the greatest monarchs of Christendom in the sixteenth century. His reign changed the complexion of English history. To him belongs the whole merit or demerit of causing the separation of England from the Roman Church. He was the real father of the English reformation, and but for him, England would be Catholic to-day. In presenting to the public this brief biography of him, only an attempt will be made to give the most incontestable facts in his career, facts sustained by both Protestant and Catholic authorities, leaving sectarists and partialists to wrangle about his motives and principles and the wisdom of his policy.

Henry came into possession of the crown of England upon the death of his father, Henry VII. This was in 1509. Henry was then eighteen years of age. The early part of his reign was quite popular, owing to his great generosity. He is represented as having been tall, strong built, well proportioned, and possessed with the air of a king. In his youth he was very vehement in his temper, bearing down whatever stood in his way. The blemishes of his character were for some time mistaken for the impetuosity of youth. Crowds of flatterers confirmed him in his vices.

Henry's chaplain was one Thomas Wolsey, the son of a butcher of Ipswich. Gifted with great abilities, unbounded ambition and audacity, this man subsequently played an important part in the affairs of England. He procured the

patronage of the bishop of Winchester, and rose rapidly in his master's favor. The young prince, with his boon companions, would frequently resort to the house of Wolsey, where he would give way to riotous pleasures in which he would not have dared indulge in his own palace. The chaplain sang, danced, fenced, played the buffoon, and related indecent stories in these orgies. It is said that he outdid the licentiousness of the younger courtiers. It is Polydore Vergil, then sub-collector of the pope's revenues in England, who tells these things. Wolsey at last attained the highest place at the council board, and the whole kingly power of the realm passed into his hand. Foreign princes sought the favor of his influence in public affairs for enormous rewards.

Soon after his accession, King Henry had married Catherine of Aragon. This princess was the widow of his brother, Arthur, and aunt to Charles V. She was five years older than Henry, and the marriage was wholly one of political considerations. D'Aubigné records that the king passed whole days in balls, banqueting, and jesting, thus squandering the treasure which the avarice of his father had hoarded together. Tourneys and splendid spectacles succeeded each other without intermission. The king took the lead on these occasions. His superior strength and skill always secured him the victory. The applause of the arena excited his vanity. The queen was sometimes present on these occasions. But her melancholy look and grave deportment illy became the tumultuous glitter of such festivities. While Henry was pursuing his pleasures, the devout Catherine was devoting nearly all her time to prayer. She was accustomed to leave her bed in the dead of the night to take a silent part in the prayers of the monks. She would kneel without cushion or carpet. After taking a little rest, she would again rise, and assume the habit of St. Francis. Then, hastily throwing on her royal robes, she was in church at six to join in the holy services.

Things went on in this way for eighteen years—Henry

pursuing his round of boisterous pleasure, Catherine entirely engrossed in her Romish devotions. Living in such different atmospheres, they could not always continue united. All at once Henry made the startling discovery that he had been living unlawfully with his dead brother's widow for eighteen years. For the first time in his life his conscience commenced to trouble him. Henry was solemnly united in marriage with Catherine on the sixth of June, 1509, six weeks after the death of his father. His elder brother, Arthur, had died at the age of fifteen, in the year 1503; and the dispensation of Pope Julius II., authorizing Henry's marriage with Catherine, had been in England for six years. But the matter of conscience does not seem to have affected him a particle till 1527. Catherine had then passed the middle age, and, it is said, was afflicted with personal infirmities. His lustful eyes had fallen on the charms of the young and blooming Anne Boleyn, one of the queen's maids of honor. This damsel was then but twenty-two, and in the full flower of youthful beauty. She had been brought up amidst the gayeties of the brilliant French court, and had there acquired all the arts of an accomplished coquette. While using every stratagem to encourage the king's unhallowed passion, Anne repelled every advance which was not made on condition of her becoming queen of England. This could be accomplished only by the death or divorce of Catherine, and Henry had not yet commenced the murder of his wives. And now for the first time in eighteen years he began to have scruples respecting his marriage. It suddenly occurred to him that he had been living all this time in an incestuous union with his brother's widow.

Henry was completely taken in the toils of an ambitious and unscrupulous woman. He bent his whole energies toward bringing about the divorce from the faithful and blameless Catharine. Neither money, labor, nor intrigue were spared to accomplish his darling object. He eloquently pleaded his qualms of conscience before his friends, and reasons of State policy before the parliament. Henry's agents

were active everywhere. They bribed the universities, and resorted to threat and the lowest arts of diplomacy to attain their end. Clement VII. was pope. He refused to grant the decree of divorce. And notwithstanding Henry had heretofore been his favorite son—the Defender of the Faith—notwithstanding England would probably be lost to the Church by his course, the Roman pontiff firmly and fearlessly refused the divorce.

Henry had promised to abide by the papal decision, and he now publicly declared his determination to give up his precious project. But Anne Boleyn was not to be thus baffled. She not only brought all her arts of blandishment to bear against the purpose of the king, but employed a powerful coadjutor to help her gain the royal prize. This was Thomas Cromwell, the son of a fuller in the vicinity of London, whom Wolsey had raised from poverty to an important position in his own household. The limits of this sketch will not suffice to tell the story of his career. Whoever has read the history of England knows the arts by which Cromwell supplanted and disgraced his noble benefactor, attained a position and a power which Wolsey had never possessed in his palmiest days, secured the divorce of Henry from Catherine, and put Anne Boleyn upon the throne.

It is the same old story of retributive justice. Henry had divorced a true and virtuous wife, and it was not long before he tired of Anne Boleyn. At her instigation he had torn from Catherine her only surviving child Mary, after having had her declared illegitimate by his parliament, and had cruelly denied the dying request of the mother to see for the last time her beloved and only daughter. Catherine of Aragon died, invoking a blessing on the head of her cruel husband. At the burial of her whom she had supplanted, Anne arrayed herself in gay attire, as for a bridal, and openly declared that she was now indeed queen without a rival. Four months elapsed, and Anne Boleyn was herself divorced and brought to the block as an adulteress and guilty of high treason.

Thomas Cranmer had been made archbishop of Canterbury.

The supple courtier was now as ready to divorce her as he had been before to divorce Catherine. Anne's daughter, Elizabeth, was declared illegitimate. The lustful eyes of the king had fallen upon one of her maids of honor, and Anne in a fit of jealousy, had been prematurely delivered of a dead male child. For this offense the beautiful Anne was brought to the block, and Henry was married to Jane Seymour the next morning after her execution. In her "Queens of England," vol. iv, p. 219, Agnes Strickland thus relates the occurrence: "On the morning of the nineteenth of May, Henry VIII. attired for the chase, with huntsmen and hounds around him, was standing under a spreading oak, breathlessly awaiting the signal gun from the Tower, which was to announce that the axe had fallen on the neck of his once 'entirely beloved Anne Boleyn.' At last, when the bright summer sun rode high toward its meridian, the sullen sound of the death-gun boomed along the windings of the Thames. Henry started with ferocious joy. 'Ha, ha!' he cried with satisfaction, 'the deed is done! Uncouple the hounds and away.' The chase that day bent toward the west, whether the stag led it in that direction or not. At nightfall the king was at Wolf Hall, in Wilts, telling the news to his elected bride. The next morning the king married the beautiful Seymour. It is commonly asserted that he wore white for mourning the day after Anne Boleyn's execution; he certainly wore white, not as mourning, but because he on that day wedded her rival."

Jane Seymour became queen of England. She died giving birth to Edward VI., in 1537. Of this event Miss Strickland writes as follows: "After a martyrdom of suffering, the queen's attendants put to Henry the really cruel question of 'whether he would wish his wife or infant to be saved.' It is affirmed, and it must be owned the speech is too characteristic of Henry to be doubted, that he replied, 'The child by all means, for other wives could be easily found'" (Queens of England, vol. iv, p. 228).

Henry next married and divorced Anne of Cleves. Crom-

well had negotiated this marriage. On her arrival in England the king was disgusted with her appearance. The fate of Cromwell was sealed that day. His head soon rolled from the block. The fifth wife who fell a victim to the royal brute was Catherine Howard, of the noble house of Norfolk. She was soon brought to the block for the alleged crime of adultery charged to have been committed *before* her marriage. The prime mover in this satanic conspiracy against the poor queen was Cranmer, the new favorite who had been elevated to Cromwell's place.

Henry's sixth and last wife was Catherine Parr, who also narrowly escaped death at his hands for high treason, which he made to consist of a difference of opinion from him in theological opinions. The order had been given for her arrest. But having made a timely discovery of her fatal mistake, the watchful and adroit Catherine hastened to make such a plausible apology for her heresy, mingled with such a flattering opinion of her royal lord's divine discrimination in religious questions, that when the officers came to convey her to the tower, Henry drove them out with blows, while loading them with kingly invective and abuse. Catherine never again ventured to dissent from her royal husband.

Out of six wives, Henry divorced two, and led two to the block. And although the fact itself is sufficient to create a shudder in the heart of every humane person, yet it will be found that the divorce and murder of his wives were not the greatest of the offenses committed by Henry VIII. against common justice and common decency.

Upon the pope's refusal to rid him of his first wife, Henry had taken the matter into his own hands, and through the new archbishop of Canterbury declared his marriage void, and crowned Anne Boleyn queen. He resolved to carry out his project, even if he had to play pope himself in England. Of course his holiness at Rome was very angry at the turn matters had taken, and raged exceedingly. But Henry did not find himself much the worse for this. Then he commenced to cut off the heads of those who refused to say he was not

the rightful head of the Church. The pope, to spite Henry, sent John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, who had ignored the king's spiritual supremacy, a cardinal's hat. To spite the pope, Henry took off the bishop's head so he could not wear the hat. Sir Thomas More, one of the most virtuous men in the realm, refused his assent to the spiritual claims of Henry. He was kept in prison a year, and then led out to the block.

It was now as dangerous to acknowledge the pope in Henry's dominions as to be his wife. The pope raged and prepared ponderous bulls, but Henry would not let them come into his kingdom. He suppressed the monasteries. This added one hundred and thirty thousand pounds a year to the treasury. Reginald Pole, a cousin of the king, being in Italy, dared attack the pretension of Henry to spiritual sovereignty. The king's rage fell upon his relatives in England. Lord Montague, the marquis of Exeter, and a number of other nobles, were all executed. The pope made Pole a cardinal. Then Henry retaliated by the execution of Pole's mother, the venerable countess of Salisbury. When she was told to lay her gray head upon the block, she answered the executioner: "No; my head never committed treason, and, if you want it, you shall seize it." Then she ran round and round the scaffold, with the executioner striking at her, and her gray hair bedabbled with blood; and even when they held her down upon the block, she moved her head about to the last, determined to abet in no way her barbarous murder.

To defy the pope and his bull and maintain his Christian supremacy, King Henry now proceeded to roast people alive for differing from his religious views. The fires of Smithfield were kept continually burning. A man named Lambert had worsted six bishops in an argument. Henry took him to feed his fire. Catholics were burnt for recognizing the pope, and Protestants were burnt for not recognizing Henry as the head of the Church in England.

The story of Anne Askew is familiar to nearly every one. This Protestant lady had committed some trifling offense

against the religious convictions of Henry. She was taken to the Tower and put upon the rack. The executioners exhausted their ingenuity and strength in the application of the torture. And then two priests, who were present, actually pulled off their robes and worked the rack with their own hands, so twisting and tearing her that she was afterwards carried to the fire in a chair. Three others were burnt with her.

No room remains for mention of Henry's military or political career, or his political executions. The time came at last when the earth was to be rid of him—when he must surrender to a mightier monarch than himself. He died in 1547, in the fifty-sixth year of his age and the thirty-eighth of his reign. His character is thus graphically portrayed by the matchless pen of Charles Dickens:

"Henry VIII. has been favored by some Protestant writers, because the Reformation was achieved in his time. But the mighty merit of it lies with other men, and not with him; and it can be rendered none the worse by this monster's crimes, and none the better by any defense of them. The plain truth is, that he was a most intolerable ruffian, a disgrace to human nature, and a blot of blood and grease upon the history of England."

HERNANDO CORTEZ.

Although Cortez was not a Church dignitary, his butchery of the Mexicans under pretense of spreading the Christian religion entitles him to a place in this volume. He found Mexico a happy heathen paradise; he left it a blighted Christian waste. He was brave but he was bigoted, and his creed converted his bravery into inhuman cruelty. The Rev. C. Sparry in his "Martyrology" says: "In the space of twelve years, from the first landing of Cortez on the continent of America to the entire reduction of the populous empire of Mexico, the amazing number of four millions of Mexicans perished, through the unparalleled barbarity of the Spaniards."

Cortez was born in Medellen, Spain, in 1485, seven years before the discovery of that new world in the conquest of which he was to play so important a part. At the age of fourteen he was sent to the University of Salamanca, but study not being to his taste he soon tired of college life and returned to his home. In 1504 he sailed for San Domingo, where he remained until 1511, when he accompanied an expedition to Cuba. Shortly after his arrival in that island he was made alcalde of the town of St. Iago, in which position he displayed considerable ability.

Upon the discovery of Mexico, Velasquez, the governor of Cuba, determined to take possession of it in the name of the sovereign of Spain. Cortez was selected to lead the expedition fitted out for that purpose, and in February, 1519, he sailed from St. Iago with eleven vessels, between six and seven hundred infantry, sixteen horsemen, and some pieces of artillery.

Cortez had been instructed to compel the Mexicans "to give in their allegiance to him, and to manifest it by regaling him with such comfortable presents of gold, pearls, and precious stones as, by showing their own good will, would secure his favor and protection," and he was not to omit anything that would add to the glory of God and his sovereign. If robbery, rapine, murder, and wholesale butchery of defenseless Mexicans add to the glory of God, Cortez obeyed his instructions to the letter. The conversion of the natives was the ostensible object of the Spaniards. They entertained no doubt as to the efficacy of conversion, however violent the means adopted or however sudden the change produced. If the argument of the tongue was weak, the argument of the sword was powerful, and the soldier-missionaries either used these arguments simultaneously or brought the stronger to bear first.

On the fourth of March the expedition reached Yucatan. Proceeding along the coast, they landed and took possession of the town of Tabasco after a short but bloody conflict, in which many of the natives were slaughtered. The news of the capture of their capital spread rapidly among the Tabascans, and several thousand of them soon gathered a short distance from the town. Cortez brought six of his heavy guns and all his horses on shore and prepared to do battle for the Lord.

On the twenty-fifth of March, all being ready, Cortez sallied forth from Tabasco at the head of his little army and marched toward the plains of Ceutla, where the natives were encamped. Though the Tabascans outnumbered the Spaniards eighty to one, they were an undisciplined, naked mob, and their arrows, stones, and other missiles dropped harmless as hail on the helmets and shields of their opponents. It was a conflict between giants and children. The Spaniards opened a heavy fire of artillery and musketry on the compact masses of the unfortunate natives and swept them down at every discharge like wheat before the sickle. The horsemen dashed through them, slashing right and left with their keen swords, filling

their hearts with dismay. Having never seen horses before, the natives supposed horse and rider to be one—some terrible monster brought to destroy them by these cruel demons. They were seized with a panic, and fled in hopeless confusion. Cortez, content with the carnage, called off his soldiers from the pursuit and mocked the Almighty by offering up thanksgivings "for the victory vouchsafed them."

The number of the slain in this first preaching of the gospel of glad tidings to the peaceful heathen is uncertain. The lowest estimate is five thousand, though Las Casas, a well-known Spanish chronicler of those times, places the number at thirty thousand. The Christians lost two killed and a few wounded. Taking from the terror-stricken natives such food as he required, such articles of value as he found, and as many of their most beautiful maidens as he desired as slaves for himself and his favorites, Cortez returned to his ships and sailed along the coast to the northward. On the twenty-first of April he landed in Mexico proper, on the spot where now stands the city of Vera Cruz. He met with a cordial welcome from the natives, and treated them kindly. His experience in Tabasco had taught him that duplicity and treachery would accomplish his work with more safety to himself and followers than would force. An embassy was dispatched to the Mexican capital by the cacique of the province to inform Montezuma, the emperor, of the desire of the Spaniards to visit him in his capital. In a few days the envoys returned, loaded with valuable presents for the Spanish commander, but bearing the refusal of the emperor to permit the strangers to penetrate to the interior. The rich gifts of gold and silver excited the cupidity of the invaders, and they determined to push on at all hazards.

A few words about the state of affairs in Mexico at this time will not be out of place here, and may assist in explaining the secret of the seemingly miraculous success attending the arms of Cortez.

The Aztecs had a religion which in its purity was Deism. They recognized the existence of a supreme Creator whom

they addressed as "the God by whom we live." But, like all religions, as time rolled on their Deism became grossly corrupted. The attributes of this one God were converted into individual gods; and in the course of time they had thirteen principal deities and upward of two hundred of inferior power. These gods were represented by images placed in their temples, as the Christian and Buddhistic gods and saints are represented in the Catholic and Chinese churches and joss-houses at the present day.

Quetzalcoatl, the god of the air, was the most loved, though not the most powerful of the Aztec gods. In some manner he angered one of the principal deities—so ran the legend—and was forced to fly from Mexico, going eastward over the ocean, but promising to return. When the Spaniards came, their advent was connected in the minds of many of the Aztecs with the return of their favorite god; and those terrible mysteries of nature, the thunder and lightning—for such the roar and flame of the firearms appeared to be—which the invaders had at their command and used with such fearful effect, seemed to prove their superhuman origin.

The condition of the Aztec monarchy at this time was most favorable for the invaders. Montezuma, the reigning sovereign, had alienated the affections of his subjects by his tyranny. The taxes demanded by the lavish expenditure of his court were exhorbitant, and the numerous petty princes under his sway were eager to throw off his yoke. Added to all this, the little independent republic of Tlascala, which had been a rival of the empire, became a powerful lever in the hands of Cortez to assist in the overthrow of Montezuma. Such was Mexico in 1619.

Proceeding northward to the Totonac territory, Cortez easily induced the cacique of that province to revolt against the authority of Montezuma. Selecting a site in this province, he founded the city of Villa Rica de Vera Cruz, which he made the base of his future operations. He remained here some time engaged in the holy work of converting the natives by the sword, and in preparing for his journey to the interior.

Discovering a plot among some of his followers to seize one of the ships and return to Cuba, he sunk his vessels in order to prevent the possibility of such an event occurring.

Some authorities assert that the vessels were burnt, but Prescott, who had unusual facilities for ascertaining the truth, in his "Conquest of Mexico," says they were sunk. That they were destroyed is settled beyond a doubt.

Leaving a portion of his troops to garrison Villa Rica, he set out for the interior. The forces taken with him on his expedition amounted to four hundred foot, fifteen horse, seven pieces of artillery, thirteen hundred of his native allies, and a thousand *tamanes* or porters to drag the guns and carry the baggage.

On the sixteenth of August, 1519, Cortez began his march for the city of Mexico. Climbing from the low lands of the coast, passing through the cities of Jalapa and Maulinco, through the rugged defile of the Bishop's Pass, around the base of the extinct volcano of Cofre de Perote, over the ridge of the Cordilleras, and down through the defile of the Sierra del Agua, they soon reached a country with the genial climate of southern Europe. He was now in the land of the Tlascalans, who attempted to oppose his further progress. They attacked the little band of Spaniards, but the lances and swords of the horsemen and the deadly fire of the musketry and artillery made fearful havoc among the naked warriors of the republic. After an engagement in which thousands of the natives were slain, the road was cleared, and Cortez pressed on for the city of Tlascala, which was reputed to be wealthy and poorly defended.

But he again encountered an army of the natives, and a more numerous one than before. Again his little troop fought bravely, and again they conquered. He now hoped, after having given them such evidences of his power, that the natives would give way quietly and offer no more resistance; but he was mistaken. He sent two envoys to their camp, to express to their leaders his friendly intentions, and to treat for peace; but his proposals were rejected with scorn. The

natives had gathered all their army and had determined to strike one decisive blow for the extermination of the fierce invaders who had come with the avowed intention of destroying their religion.

On the fifth of September, 1519, Cortez advanced to meet the foe. The Tlascalans, naked, painted, and armed only with light spears and darts pointed with stone or copper, greeted the Spaniards with a harmless volley of stones and arrows. Cortez halted, formed his troops, and opened a deadly fire upon the Indians. Every shot told, and the field was soon covered with the slain. At length the demoralized mob of Tlascalans, driven to desperation by the galling fire of the Spaniards, swept down like a torrent upon the little army and attempted to crush it to the earth by weight of numbers; and they almost succeeded. But the Spaniards rallied, and, favored by dissensions in the ranks of their opponents, they eventually conquered. Demoralized and broken in spirit, the Tlascalans withdrew and left the field to the invincible Spaniards.

Cortez seized this as a favorable opportunity to bring the vanquished to terms, and, if possible, to make them his allies. He had seen, long ere this, that his success would depend upon fighting one part of the empire with the other; and the Tlascalans were the bravest foes he had yet encountered. Again he sent envoys to their capital, promising them pardon for all past injuries if they accepted his offer, but threatening death to all if they refused. The envoys found the Tlascalans plunged in the deepest dejection. Submission to the inevitable was the only course left, and they accepted the terms of Cortez.

Meanwhile the Spanish commander, at the head of his men, was scouring the country in search of plunder. Under pretext of converting the natives to Christianity, they took possession of whatever pleased their eye, and took signal vengeance upon all who offered resistance. They spared neither age nor sex. On one foray Cortez himself burned more than ten villages. In a letter he said, vauntingly, "Quemé mas de diez pueblos" (Hist. de la Conqusta, cap. 54).

In a letter to the Spanish emperor, he says: "As we fought under the standard of the cross, for the true faith, and the service of your highness, heaven crowned our arms with such success that, while multitudes of the Infidels were slain, little loss was suffered by the Castilians." It was the Church against the Infidel. Every crime that was committed against the inhabitants of this happy country was committed for the glory of God and the advancement of the Church. The robbery of the natives, the destruction of their *teocallis*, or temples, the burning of their villages, the debauching of their maidens by a brutal soldiery, and the massacre of all who opposed them in their hellish work—all these crimes were justified by the one short phrase, "They were Infidels."

The Tlascalan general sent a party of his men to arrange the terms of peace with the conquerors. Cortez, to add to the terror with which he had already inspired the natives, cut off the hands of fifty of those who had visited him under protection of a flag of truce. He afterwards attempted to justify his conduct by asserting that they were spies; but they had come to his camp in broad daylight, and tried to see nothing but what he was pleased to allow. This last outrage filled the cup of sorrow which the Tlascalans were destined to drain to the very dregs. Filled with superstitious terror at the barbarous deeds of the merciless Christians, they submitted at once to their conquerors. The bloody war with the republic of Tlascala was ended, and Cortez had secured a powerful ally to aid him in his future operations.

The conquerers immediately set about the conversion of the natives, which they attempted to do in a wholesale manner. They were mustered in the public squares and, after the preaching of the priests had been explained to them by interpreters, they were driven to the lake near by and baptized *en masse*. "To avoid the perplexity of selection, it was common for the missionary to give the same names to all the Indians baptized on the same day. Thus, one day was set apart for the Johns, another for the Peters. and so on" (Camargo,

Hist. de Tlascala, MS). The officers and men of the army of Cortez selected as many of the handsomest maidens as they required and, after removing the stain of Infidelity by baptism, used them for their lustful purposes, and all the tortures of the Inquisition were visited upon those who dared to fight for their honor.

Montezuma, in his capital, had been advised of the progress of the invaders, and now sought to stay their advance by bribes and presents of gold and silver; but these gifts only made the Spaniards more eager to press on and take at once the source of the supply. Selecting six thousand of his new allies, Cortez again set out for the city of the Montezumas. After a march through a beautiful and well-cultivated country he entered the Holy City of the Aztecs, Cholula, a city with wide and regular streets and well-built houses. His Tlascalan allies, between whom and the Cholulans there existed an undying hatred, he left outside the city for fear of trouble with the citizens. The Spaniards attempted to repeat here the excesses which they had performed with impunity at Tlascala, but the Cholulans were soon aroused and determined to defend their homes. They prepared to punish the invaders for their crimes, and laid plans for their capture. Cortez, learning of their intentions, laid a trap for the unsuspecting citizens, into which they fell. Placing his artillery in the great square under the pretense of preparing to leave the city, he planted it so as to command the avenues leading thereto, and forming his soldiers in line, he requested an interview with the caciques. They soon appeared at the head of a large body of their retainers. Their appearance was the signal for a general massacre of the defenseless Cholulans.

"The made scarcely any resistance to the Spaniards, who followed up the discharge of their pieces by rushing on them with their swords; and, as the half-naked bodies of the natives afforded no protection, they hewed them down with as much ease as the reaper mows down the ripe corn in harvest time. Some endeavored to scale the walls but only afforded a surer mark to the arquebusiers and archers. Oth-

ers threw themselves into the gateways, but were received on the long pikes of the soldiers who guarded them. Some few had better luck in hiding themselves under the heaps of slain with which the ground was soon loaded.

"While this work of death was going on, the countrymen of the slaughtered Indians, drawn together by the noise of the massacre, had commenced a furious assault on the Spaniards from without. But Cortez had placed his battery of heavy guns in a position that commanded the avenues, and swept off the files of the assailants as they rushed on. In the intervals between the discharges, which, in the imperfect state of the science in that day, were much longer than in ours, he forced back the press by charging with the horse into the midst. The steeds, the guns, the weapons of the Spaniards were all new to the Cholulans. Notwithstanding the novelty of the terrific spectacle, the flash of fire-arms mingling with the deafening roar of the artillery as its thunders reverberated among the buildings, the despairing Indians pushed on to take the places of their fallen comrades.

"While this fierce struggle was going forward, the Tlascalans, hearing the concerted signal, had advanced with quick pace into the city. They had bound, by order of Cortez wreaths of sedge round their heads, that they might the more surely be distinguished from the Cholulans. Coming up in the very heat of the engagement, they fell on the defenseless rear of the townsmen, who, trampled down under the heels of the Castilian cavalry on one side, and galled by their vindictive enemies on the other, could no longer maintain their ground. They gave way, some taking refuge in the nearest buildings, which, being partly of wood, were speedily set on fire. Othere fled to the temples. One strong party with a number of priests at its head got possession of the great *teocalli*. There was a vulgar tradition, already alluded to, that, on removal of the walls, the god would send forth an inundation to overwhelm his enemies. The superstitious Cholulans with great difficulty succeeded in wrenching away some of the stones in the walls of the edifice. But dust, not

water, followed. Their false god deserted them in the hour of need. In despair they flung themselves into the wooden turrets that crowned the temple, and poured down stones, javelins, and burning arrows on the Spaniards, as they climbed the great staircase, which by a flight of one hundred and twenty steps, scaled the face of the pyramid. But the fiery shower fell harmless on the steel bonnets of the Christians, while they availed themselves of the burning shafts to set fire to the wooden citadel, which was speedily wrapped in flames. Still the garrison held out, and though quarter, *it is said*, was offered, only one Cholulan availed himself of it. The rest threw themselves headlong from the parapet or perished miserably in the flames.

"All was now confusion and uproar in the fair city which had so lately reposed in security and peace. The groans of the dying, the frantic supplications of the vanquished for mercy, were mingled with the loud battle-cries of the Spaniards as they rode down their enemy, and with the shrill whistle of the Tlascalans, who gave full scope to the long-cherished rancor of ancient rivalry. The tumult was still further swelled by the incessant rattle of musketry, and the crash of falling timbers, which sent up a volume of flame that outshone the ruddy light of morning, making all together a hideous confusion of sights and sounds that converted the Holy City into a pandemonium. As resistance slackened, the victors broke into the houses and sacred places, plundering them of whatever valuables they contained, plate, jewels, which were found in some quantity, wearing apparel, and provisions, the last two coveted even more than the former by the simple Tlascalans, thus facilitating a division of the spoils much to the satisfaction of their Christian confederates" (Prescott, Conquest of Mexico, vol. ii, pp. 24–27).

According to Las Casas, Cortez caused a hundred or more of the caciques to be impaled or roasted at the stake. The same writer places the number of Cholulans massacred on this occasion at six thousand, though other authorities give a much greater number. But what mattered it to Cortez?

They were Infidels, and deserved death for their unbelief, though they were Infidels through ignorance. According to the pope's decision, their territory belonged to the sovereign of Spain, and they might be swept from it as trespassers unless they were required as slaves.

This last proof of the invincibility of the invaders confirmed the superstitious natives in their belief that the descendants of their departed god were indeed among them. The neighboring cities tendered their allegiance, and sought favor by sending rich presents of gold and female slaves to the conquerors. The Aztec emperor felt that his power was gone; and he trembled on his tottering throne.

Cortez pressed on. Across the once blooming, but now desolated, country of the humbled Cholulans, up the bold sierra which separates the great plateaus of Mexico and Pueblo, between the two highest mountains on the North American continent, Popocatapetl, and Iztaccihuatl, through the intricate gorges of the sierra, on he marched at the head of his little troop of Christian fiends, till at last the beautiful valley of Mexico appeared like a gorgeous panorama before him. A paradise, radiant with blooming flowers, studded with orchards and hamlets, and in the midst, like a great flower-encircled mirror, the fairy lake, Tezcuco, bearing on its bosom the beautiful Venice of the Aztecs, Mexico, the royal residence of the Aztec sovereigns—such was the beautiful vision that greeted the eager eyes of the cruel Christians. They came; they saw; they devastated. In the name of a merciful God, they destroyed without mercy. In the name of a holy religion, they committed most horrible crimes. In the name of a higher civilization, they reveled in bloodshed and carnage. Death and destruction were dealt to the unhappy Infidels by the demons of a cruel creed, and desolation and ruin marked the path of their progress.

Resistless as fate, Cortez marched on; through the beautiful valley, over the magnificent causeway that led through the sparkling waters of the lake, on he marched, right into the heart of the great city, into the presence of the wondering

emperor. Montezuma, filled with a superstitious awe at the terrible power of the "Children of the Sun," as he supposed the Christians to be, offered no resistance to their progress. On the contrary, he received them with respect and courtly dignity, loaded them with valuable presents, and gave them a magnificent palace for their residence. Including his native allies, Cortez had about seven thousand men when he entered the Mexican capital. These were comfortably quartered, clothed, and ample provision made for their maintenance by the munificent hospitality of the emperor. What return was made for this princely generosity future events will show.

The garrison left at Villa Rica, by their excesses, had driven the natives to revolt. In a conflict which took place, several of the Spaniards had been killed. Cortez availed himself of this occurrence as a pretext for seizing upon the person of the Mexican emperor and holding him a prisoner until reparation was made. The governor of the disaffected province was brought into the presence of Cortez, who condemned him to a horrible punishment. In the square in front of the palace of Cortez, the unfortunate governor, with some of his caciques and followers, was burned to death, surrounded and taunted by the soldiers of the cross. The citizens, awed by the previous deeds of the inhuman soldiery, dared not interfere.

Using the captive emperor as a tool, Cortez succeeded in inducing the different nobles and princes of the empire to visit the capital, where they were seized and immured in the same prison with their sovereign. Cortez was virtually master of Mexico.

True to their avaricious instincts, the Spaniards now set about securing the royal treasure. Everything of value was converted to their use. All the ornaments of gold and silver they could obtain were broken up and cast into ingots for convenience in transportation. According to Prescott, the enormous sum of six million, three hundred thousand dollars was thus plundered from the Aztecs. As is usual in such cases, the plunderers quarreled over the division of the

spoils. Their ill-gotten gains well-nigh proved their ruin. But Cortez, by his firmness, soon restored order.

The governor of Cuba, anxious about the fate of Cortez and his companions, sent a second expedition, consisting of nine hundred men, to Mexico, under the command of Panfilo de Narvaez. Upon his arrival, Narvaez demanded that Cortez submit to his authority. Cortez was not inclined to give up the honors he had won, so he determined to resist the attempted usurpation of Narvaez. After having lorded it for six months in the Mexican capital, he set out with a part of his troops and allies, marched to the coast, surprised Narvaez at night, and, after a short skirmish, was once more sole master of Mexico.

During the absence of Cortez, one of the most inhuman massacres of the whole campaign took place in the capital. Some six hundred of the flower of the Aztec nobility had assembled in the court of the great *teocalli* to celebrate one of their religious festivals. Alvarado, who had charge of the garrison, attended with his soldiers as spectators. While the attention of the Aztecs was engrossed in their ceremonies, Alvarado and his men, at a concerted signal, rushed upon the unarmed nobles with drawn swords. Unprotected by armor of any kind, the Aztecs were hewn down right and left. The fierce Spaniards showed no mercy in their bloody work. Those of the victims who fled to the gates were caught on the pikes of soldiers. Those who attempted to scale the wall were cut to pieces or shot by the brutal Christian soldiers of the cross. Not an Aztec of all that company was left alive. And the only excuse that can be offered for this terrible butchery is that they were Infidels engaged in heathenish ceremonies which were displeasing to the God of the Christians.

This last outrage drove the Mexicans to desperation. Cortez returned to the capital only to defend himself from the fierce assaults of the outraged Aztecs. For days a terrible conflict raged in the streets of the royal city. Montezuma, who was still a prisoner to the Spaniards, was slain—pierced

by an Aztec javelin. Cortez himself was wounded. It was at last determined to fly from the city; but flight was no easy task. Shortly after midnight, on the first of July, 1520, the Spaniards set out on their retreat from the city which they had disgraced by their inhuman deeds. This was the historical *noche triste*, or melancholy night. Cortez had to fight every inch of the retreat, and left dead, on the causeway and in the canals which he crossed in his progress, fully two-thirds of his force, losing the greater part of his treasure and all his baggage, artillery, and muskets. Back toward the coast the crestfallen conquerors wended their way. The picture was reversed. All was dark. They had sown the wind; they were reaping the whirlwind.

Otumba was reached on the eighth of July. The natives had gathered in force to give battle to their enemies. The battle was fought, but Cortez was victorious, and he reached Tlascala without further molestation. Here he was reinforced by fresh troops that had been sent out by the governor of Cuba, but who at once joined the command of Cortez on landing. A vessel arrived from Europe loaded with arms and military stores. Cortez purchased both vessel and cargo. He was now prepared to retrieve his fallen fortune.

Meanwhile Montezuma's successor, Cuitlahua, after a reign of four months, had died. He was succeeded by Guatemozin, nephew of Montezuma. The young prince prepared to resist the Spaniards, with whose design of returning to retake the capital, he was acquainted. He strengthened his army in the city, and sent out the useless part of the population.

Again Cortez, at the head of his army, set out for the capital. This time his army consisted of six hundred infantry, forty horsemen, eighty arquebusiers, and nearly a hundred thousand native allies, whom he had sufficiently Christianized to convert into soldiers. He had also ten pieces of artillery. In a few days they had reached and taken possession of Tezcuco, a city on the lake of the same name, a few leagues northeast of the city of Mexico. They found the place deserted, and, of course, despoiled it of its treasures and

burned one of its royal palaces, the depository of the national archives. Cortez made this city his headquarters during the rest of the campaign. He now began a systematical blockade of the Aztec capital, determined to starve it into submission. That city being built on an island in the lake, communication was easily cut off. Vessels were built in Tlascala, transported over the mountains in pieces on the backs of *tamanes*, and put together on the lake of Tezcuco in readiness for the taking of the capital by assault when the citizens should be weakened by famine.

Cortez lost no time in idleness. Town after town was taken by his troops, the inhabitants being robbed and converted or massacred; and his native allies were as apt in the sacking of the captured cities as were the Christians of longer standing. While operating here, the Spaniards were reinforced by the arrival of three vessels, with two hundred men, plenty of arms and ammunition, seventy or eighty horses, and, more valuable than all, a Dominican friar armed with a quantity of indulgences from the pope, pardoning the sins of those engaged in war against the Infidel—for a consideration. The worthy agent of the head of the Church drove a brisk trade with his spiritual wares, and returned home well loaded with gold and silver.

City after city had surrendered to the conquerers, and Mexico alone held out. The famine in that city was terrible. The citizens were reduced to the horrible necessity of resorting to cannibalism. At last Cortez deemed it time to take the city by assault. He attacked it both by the causeways and by water. Day after day the assault continued. The natives fought bravely and desperately, but it was all in vain. They were forced to succumb. Pestilence, fire, and famine aided the Spaniards in their work of destruction, and the royal city fell. The heroic defense of the Emperor Guatemozin had exasperated the conquerors, and they spared neither old nor young in the sack which followed the capture: all were put to the sword. Guatemozin himself was taken fighting bravely at his post; and, to the everlasting disgrace

of Cortez and his followers, they put him to the torture. Even here he showed his unsubdued spirit. "When his companion, the cacique of Tacuba, who was put to the torture with him, testified his anguish by his groans, Guatemozin coldly rebuked him by exclaiming, 'And do you think I, then, am taking my pleasure in my bath?'" (Prescott.)

This last success ended the campaign and the empire. The outlying provinces passed quietly under the Spanish yoke. A few insurrections sprang up at intervals, but they were soon quelled. Conversion progressed rapidly, and the natives had soon exchanged their Aztec heathenism for Roman paganism.

In 1524 Cortez dispatched Christoval de Olid to plant a colony in Honduras. As soon as established in that province, Olid set up an independent government of his own. Cortez at once marched at the head of a small army and subdued the rebellious officer. Returning to the capital, he soon afterwards sailed for Spain, where he received a brilliant reception at court. After receiving some valuable grants of land and vassals from the Spanish monarch, he returned to Mexico and retired to the city of Cuernavaca, leaving the government of Mexico to the Spanish viceroy. But he soon tired of the quiet life of a *haciendado*, and in 1533 he fitted out an expedition and explored the west coast of Mexico. After having spent six years and the greater part of his fortune in explorations—searching for more worlds to conquer—he again returned to Spain in 1540. In the following year he accompanied the Emperor Charles V. on his disastrous expedition to Algiers. Returning to Spain he withdrew to the village of Castellaja de la Cuesta, where he died on the second of December, 1547, in the sixty-third year of his age.

FRANCISCO PIZARRO.

This famous adventurer and champion of the Church, the discoverer and conqueror of Peru, was the illegitimate son of a Spanish officer and a peasant girl. He was born in Truxillo, a city of Estremadura, Spain, about the year 1471; and in early life was employed as a swineherd. He grew to manhood without being able to read or write. Leaving his swine, he embarked for America in 1510. After serving fourteen years in various enterprises in the West Indies and on the main-land, he joined Diego de Almagro in an expedition down the west coast of South America.

After having discovered Peru, a land in which gold and silver abounded, he returned to Panama, whence he proceeded to Spain, and obtained from Charles V. the title of governor and captain-general of the newly-discovered country. With the assistance of friends he equipped an expedition with which he returned to America. Early in January he sailed from Panama with three small vessels carrying one hundred and eighty men and twenty-seven horses for the cavalry.

Landing on the coast of Peru, the Spaniards commenced their work of conversion, massacre, and robbery in the name of religion. "Everywhere Pizarro made proclamation that he came in the name of the holy vicar of God and of the sovereign of Spain, requiring the obedience of the inhabitants as true children of the Church and vassals of his lord and master" (Prescott). He enforced this proclamation by some of the most infamous acts of butchery and treachery that stain the records of crime. Before paying the penalty of his life for his cruel tyranny he had robbed the defenseless inhab

itants of a mighty empire of their property for himself and followers, of their bodies for his sovereign, and of their souls for his Church. And all who offered the least resistance were massacred or burnt at the stake.

Pedro Pizarro, brother to the conqueror, who accompanied the expedition, in speaking of the treatment of the Peruvians, writes as follows: "We fell on them, sword in hand, for, if we had advised the Indians of our approach, we should never have found there such a store of gold and precious stones."

After ravaging the coast, robbing and murdering the inoffensive natives in the name of his Church and king, from the Bay of St. Matthew to the Piura river, he proceeded inland, after having founded the colony of San Miguel at the mouth of the Piura.

About seven years before the advent of the Spaniards, Peru was governed by the Inca Huayna Capac. Upon his death, the empire was divided between his two sons, Atahualpa, who took the northern part of the empire, and made Quito his capital, and Huascar, who resided at Cuzo, in the south. The royal brothers reigned quietly and peacefully for a few years, but shortly before the arrival of Pizarro trouble had arisen between them. When the Spaniards reached the country civil war had been raging for some time. Remembering the use that Cortez had made of the different provinces of Mexico, using them as weapons against each other for his own benefit, Pizarro saw at once the opportunity these internal dissensions offered him for obtaining the mastery of Peru, and he was not slow to avail himself of it.

On his march to the interior, Pizarro changed his tactics. He did all he could to conciliate and gain the good will of the natives, hoping in this way to impress one or other of the rival Incas favorably, and his efforts were successful. Atahualpa sent an embassy to meet the advancing Spaniards, requesting their aid in defeating his royal brother. Pizarro gladly responded to the request of the Inca. Crossing the Andes with his little troop of steel-clad soldiers, less than two

hundred in number, he marched rapidly down the eastern slope of the mountains, through beautiful and well-cultivated valleys, on a broad and well-paved highway, and into the city of Caxamarca. They found the city prepared for their reception, the Inca and his army being encamped a few miles east of the city.

Pizarro, remembering the daring maneuvre of Cortez in securing the person of the Mexican emperor, now cunningly laid a plan for the capture of the unsuspecting Atahualpa. The plaza of the city, of which he now had sole possession, was surrounded by low stone buildings with wide doors, which made admirable quarters for his troops. Pizarro saw that if he could only induce the Inca to visit him and present himself in this plaza, he would have him in his power. He laid his plans well, and arranged his men so as to be most effective should his crafty stratagem succeed.

All being arranged, Pizarro sent an embassy, escorted by his little squad of cavalry, to report his arrival to the Inca and to request an interview. The embassy was courteously received, and the Inca, escorted by his nobles and several thousand unarmed attendants, soon appeared in the grand plaza of Caxamarca. "Pizarro saw that the hour had come. He waved a white scarf in the air, the appointed signal. The fatal gun was fired from the fortress. Then springing into the square, the Spanish captain and his followers shouted the old war-cry of 'St. Jago and at them.' It was answered by the battle-cry of every Spaniard in the city, as, rushing from the avenues of the great halls in which they were concealed, they poured into the plaza, horse and foot, each in his own dark column, and threw themselves into the midst of the Indian crowd. The latter, taken by surprise, stunned by the report of artillery and muskets, the echoes of which reverberated like thunder from the surrounding buildings, and blinded by the smoke which rolled in sulphurous volumes along the square, were seized with a panic. They knew not whither to fly for refuge from the coming ruin. Nobles and commoners—all were trampled down under the fierce charge

of the cavalry, who dealt their blows, right and left, without sparing; while their swords, flashing through the thick gloom, carried dismay into the hearts of the wretched natives, who now, for the first time, saw the horse and his rider in all their terrors. They made no resistance—as, indeed, they had no weapons with which to make it. Every avenue to escape was closed, for the entrance to the square was choked up with the dead bodies of men who had perished in vain efforts to fly; and, such was the agony of the survivors under the terrible pressure of their assailants, that a large body of Indians, by their convulsive struggles, burst through the wall of stone and dried clay which formed part of the boundary of the plaza. It fell, leaving an opening of more than a hundred paces, through which multitudes now found their way into the country, still hotly pursued by the cavalry, who, leaping the fallen rubbish, hung on the rear of the fugitives, striking them down in all directions." This quotation, from Prescott's "Conquest of Peru," is given to show the method used by Pizarro to Christianize the natives of the New World.

The Inca was taken prisoner, and as he was, in fact, the government of the empire, Peru was at the mercy of the invaders. Disheartened and awe-struck by this horrible butchery—there were between five and ten thousand natives killed in this massacre, while the Christians did not lose a man—the Peruvians permitted the conquerors to take possession of an entire empire.

The Inca offered Pizarro, as the price of his liberty, to fill the room in which he was confined with vessels and ornaments of gold. The offer was accepted, and the treasure was brought. After receiving as a ransom for the life of the Inca, gold to the value of, according to Prescott, fifteen millions and a half of dollars, Pizarro basely and cruelly put Atahualpa to death.

From Caxamarca Pizarro proceeded to Cuzo, laying the country waste as he proceeded, and robbing and massacring the inhabitants. Almagro had joined him with reinforcements from Panama, and his army, strengthened by the new

recruits, emboldened by their successes, and made more ferocious and cruel by the blood they had already spilt, now acted more like fiends or devils than human beings. After a few slight engagements with the natives, they entered the city of Cuzco, which they proceeded to rob and convert. "The Cross and gold" appeared to be the motto of Pizarro and his followers. Death and desolation marked every step of his progress.

Establishing himself in the magnificent city of Cuzco, the capital of the empire, the Spanish conqueror proceeded to mold the affairs of Peru as his humor or judgment dictated. He organized a municipal government for the city of Cuzco modeled after those in the cities of Spain. He appointed alcades or governors for the various cities of the empire from among his favorite followers, and parceled out the nation as though it was a farm which he was dividing among his children. Churches, cathedrals, convents, and monasteries were erected on the ruins of the temples of the sun by the enforced labor of the unfortunate natives, and priests, friars, and monks were not lacking to convert them to the "true faith." Adventurers flocked into the country from Panama, Cuba, Mexico, and the Old World, and every vessel that reached the isthmus from Spain brought its quota of those parasites of superstition, the black-robed brethren of the various Catholic orders, to complete the work which the inhuman conquerors had begun. Spies were prowling about through the nation seeking where the natives had concealed gold or silver, and the discovery of a hidden treasure meant confiscation of the property and death to the owner. But the Christian plunderers were merciful in one respect—they gave the natives the sweet consolation of dying in the religion of Jesus. Though the poor, industrious, frugal, and honest Peruvian might not understand the beauties of a religion which made bloodthirsty demons and unscrupulous robbers of its most devoted professors, and which only wrought ruin to themselves and destruction to their nation, they were compelled to accept it or perish at the stake.

In the year 1534, Ferdinand Pizarro, brother of the conquerer, conveyed to Spain the royal share of the Peruvian plunder, and laid it at the feet of Charles V.; whereupon Pizarro was confirmed in his power as governor of Peru, while Almagro was granted all the country that might be discovered south of Pizarro's vice-royalty. Whilst Pizarro was engaged in settling affairs in Peru, Almagro proceeded south with his force to attempt the conquest of Chili. In 1536 the persecuted and outraged Peruvians having revolted against their cruel and inhuman conquerors, Almagro returned to Peru, and after assisting in the defeat of the insurgent natives, a disagreement arose between the rival chieftains. Almagro fell into the hands of his more powerful rival, and in 1538 he was tried and executed. Pizarro was now left alone in power in South America, and he began to rule in a despotic and cruel manner. Becoming enraged at the tyranny of their former captain, several of the Spaniards joined in a conspiracy with the son of Almagro, and in 1541 Pizarro and a few of his adherents were set upon and killed.

Pizarro was the most perfidious of those monsters of religion and cruelty who made it their life-work to reduce the natives of America to slavery. His perfidy to his men made him odious among the Spaniards and his treacherous and cruel treatment of the Inca Atahualpa made his name a by-word for perfidy among the natives of Peru.

When Pizarro gained possession of Peru it was well advanced in the arts of civilization; the natives were living in tranquillity and safety, and the land was rejoicing in abundance. Pizarro delivered up the inhabitants to his brutal soldiery; "the sacred cloisters were abandoned to their lust; the towns and villages were given up to pillage; the wretched natives were parcelled out like slaves, to toil for their conquerors in the mines; the flocks were scattered and wantonly destroyed; the graneries were dissipated; the beautiful contrivances for the more perfect culture of the soil were suffered to fall into decay; the paradise was converted into a desert."

CHARLES V.

CHARLES V., the most powerful monarch of the sixteenth century, was born at Ghent, February 24, 1500. He was the heir of four great royal lines, which had become united by a series of fortunate matrimonial alliances. His father, Philip of Austria, transmitted to him the possessions of the Netherlands and the dominions of Austria, as well as a solid claim to the imperial crown of Germany. Ferdinand and Isabella, whose grandson he was, handed down to him the united monarchy, increased by the conquest of Granada in 1492, by the addition of the two Sicilies in 1504, by the annexation of the southern part of Navarre in 1512, and by the discovery of the New World. He inherited the Netherlands on the death of his father in 1506, the crown of Spain and Naples on the death of Ferdinand in 1516, and the archdukedom of Austria on the death of his grandfather, Maximilian, in 1519. Seldom, if ever, has any one been born to such vast cares and weighty responsibilities as fell to him, and seldom, in the history of kings, has any one more persistently used his power for evil. Before his birth Columbus had discovered for him a world of fabulous wealth; when he was only fifteen a European saw for the first time the Pacific ocean; while the crown of Charlemagne and Barbarossa was being placed on his head at Aix-la-Chapelle, Magellan was prosecuting the great voyage which was to bring the ends of the earth together and prove to the world the falsity of the holy records, and Cortez' ruffians were rioting in the halls of the Montezumas. Ere he had been twenty years on the throne of Spain, Pizarro had completed his conquest of Peru and driven the Incas from their immemorial heritage. The

ingenious and energetic population of the Netherlands were carrying industry to a point till that time unexampled in the world, while the vast wealth they were accumulating could, in the hands of a man less inquisitorial than the emperor, have become an almost exhaustless source of revenue. Had Charles been less a churchman and more a king; had he listened less to his religious teachers and given more care to the welfare of all his subjects; had he been a man capable of rising above the piety of the priest to the duty of a monarchy; had he possessed any idea of liberty except that dictated by policy, a career of splendor was opened to him surpassing in grandeur the glory of a god. But he was called to a place to which his strength was unequal. He sunk the monarch in the man, and the man was unprincipled. He was religious, yet he fought the pope; he loved empire, while he lessened his power by murdering his subjects. Religion and ambition were his ruin, if we regard his reign with the eye of humanity.

In 1517 he entered upon the government of Spain. Previous to this he had resided in the Netherlands, which provinces he was soon to drive almost to despair by his establishment, within their borders, of the Inquisition of the holy Roman Catholic Church. Charles was not a fanatic in religion, although he did his utmost to stifle the Reformation, whose germs were sprouting and sending out shoots in the German and Dutch districts of his possessions. In his younger days he was under the religious instruction of Adrian of Utrecht—afterwards pope by the name of Adrian VI.—but who failed to inspire in him any love for scholastic lore.

In 1519 he was, on the death of Maximilian, elected to the imperial crown. The archdukedom of Austria was in a critical state on account of the alarming progress of the Turks, and Charles was chosen on the plea that it required a powerful protector. About the time he was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, the throne of Turkey was ascended by Soliman the Magnificent, who carried the Ottoman empire to the very

pinnacle of its power. From his coronation Charles proceeded to the Diet of Worms, which opened on the twenty-eighth of January, 1521. Though political considerations exerted a powerful influence upon him in his government, he was a Catholic by conviction and profession, which belief "neutralized all his excellencies of character." After his twenty-first year he never allowed a day to pass without spending some portion of it in prayer. He heard mass daily and listened to a sermon every Sunday and holiday. He confessed and received the sacrament four times a year—three more times than is indispensable to carry a Catholic to the gates of heaven. He was sometimes to be seen in his tent at midnight, kneeling before a crucifix, with hands uplifted and eyes rolling in devotion. In Lent he ate no meat himself and used much diligence to discover and punish such of his courtiers as failed to fast during the whole forty days. "He was too good a politician not to know the value of broad phylacteries and long prayers. He was too nice an observer of human nature not to know how easily mint and cummin could still outweigh the 'weightier matters of law, judgment, mercy, and faith'; as if the founder of the religion which he professed, and to maintain which he had established the Inquisition and the edicts, had never cried woe upon the Pharisees." The traditions of the empire demanded, beside, that he should support the Church.

The Reformation had gained too great strength in Germany to admit of his using the summary measures which were congenial to his nature, and which he employed in the Netherlands. Luther was heard at the diet, and his safe conduct respected; but at the close Charles had the ban of the empire pronounced upon him and his adherents, and issued the following edict: "As it appears," said this essentially religious document, "that the aforesaid Martin is not a man, but a devil under the form of a man, and clothed in the dress of a priest, the better to bring the human race to hell and damnation, therefore all his disciples and converts are to be punished with death and forfeiture of all their goods." Had the

"aforesaid Martin" been all that the emperor so ingenuously asserted, it would by no means have been the first or only time in which the priests have brought "hell and damnation upon the human race." Christ came to bring a sword, and the priests, from Peter to Pius IX., have been messengers only of evil. This bloody edict, "issued without even a pretense of sanction by the estates," was carried into immediate execution. The papal Inquisition was introduced into the provinces, and the bloody work, for which the reign of Charles in the Netherlands is distinguished, was commenced. Two Augustine monks, burned at Brussels, July 1, 1523, were the first victims to Lutheranism in the provinces. Their execution caused Erasmus to observe, with a sigh, that "two had been burned at Brussels, and that the city now began strenuously to favor Lutheranism."

Pope Adrian VI., the emperor's former tutor, was keenly alive to the shortcomings of the churchman. At the diet of Nuremburg, summoned to put down Luther, he declared, through the bishop of Fabriane, that "these disorders had sprung from the sins of men, more especially from the sins of priests and prelates. Even in the holy chair," said he, "many horrible crimes have been committed." Adrian, according to his epitaph, regarded his election to the papal chair as the greatest misfortune of his life.

Another edict of Charles', published in the Netherlands, "forbids all private assemblies for devotion; all reading of the Scriptures; all discussions within one's own doors concerning faith, the sacraments, the papal authority, or other religious matter, under penalty of death. The edicts were no dead letter. The fires were kept constantly supplied with human fuel by monks, who knew the art of burning reformers better than that of arguing with them. The scaffold was the most conclusive of syllogisms, and used upon all occasions. Still the people remained unconvinced. Thousands of burned heretics had not made a single convert.

"A fresh edict renewed and sharpened the punishment for reading the Scriptures in private or public. At the same time,

the violent personal altercation between Luther and Erasmus, upon predestination, together with the bitter dispute between Luther and Zwingli concerning the real presence, did more to impede the progress of the Reformation than ban or edict, sword or fire. The spirit of humanity hung her head, finding that the bold reformer had only a new dogma in place of the old ones, seeing that dissenters, in their turn, were sometimes as ready as papists with axe, fagot, and excommunication. In 1526, Felix Mants, the Anabaptist, is drowned at Zurich, in obedience to Zwingli's pithy formula—*Qui iterum mergit mergatur*. Thus the Anabaptists, upon their first appearance, were exposed to the fires of the Church and the water of the Zwinglians."

After his return from Worms, Charles remained in Spain till 1529, directing the war with Francis, in which he was victorious. The French were defeated in Navarre and driven from Milan and from the whole of Italy. The imperialists failed in an invasion of Provence and in the seige of Marseilles, but were compensated by the splendid victory at Pavia, in which the French sustained enormous losses, and Francis himself was made prisoner. In his treatment of the captive king, Charles was oblivious of every principle of chivalry, which aroused Henry of England and Clement VII. into espousing the cause of the Frenchman. Francis nominally accepted the humiliating peace of Madrid which Charles forced upon him, but upon his liberation immediately recommenced the war, aided by his allies. Charles was, however, again successful. The army of Bourbon plundered Rome and kept the pope prisoner in the castle of San Angelo, and Francis was forced from Italy. In 1529 occurred the peace of Cambray, which healed for a time the differences of the monarchs.

Leaving Spain under the regency of Isabella, queen of Portugal, whom he had wedded in 1526, Charles proceeded to Italy. At Bologna he had an interview with the pope, who crowned him emperor and king of Italy. After having arranged the affairs of that kingdom, he crossed into Germany

to attend the diet summoned to meet at Augsburg in 1530. The Reformation had made marvelous progress in the nine years which had elapsed since the Edict of Worms, notwithstanding the Peasants' War, the fanaticism of the Anabaptists, the strenuous opposition of the spiritual and temporal powers of southern Germany, and the edicts of Charles. The emperor first exerted his power at the Diet of Augsburg to bring about a reconciliation of the religious differences, but the Protestants holding firmly to their confession they had presented, his religious principles overcame his statesmanship, and he issued an edict against them. The Protestants formed themselves into the Smalcaldian league, under the leadership of Saxony and Hesse, which, from the end of 1530, continued to be the bulwark of German Protestantism.

Owing to the threatening position of the Sultan Soliman on the frontiers of southeastern Germany, Charles felt it necessary to unite the empire, and effected a compromise with the Protestants of Germany, by which freedom of worship was secured till the assembly of a general council. He gathered one of the most splendid armies ever equipped and took the field in person. The sultan retreated. Charles, being unable to pursue him, returned through Italy to Spain.

His next expedition was against the pirate Barbarossa, whom he defeated, capturing Tunis and releasing thousands of slaves. The same year (1535) war was resumed with Francis, who had formed an alliance with the Turks. A revolt of Ghent toward the close of the year 1539, necessitated the presence of Charles in that city. The cruel edicts issued against Lutheranism and the bloody persecution which had been carried on by the emperor's agents had at last aroused the peaceful inhabitants to a refusal to contribute to the revenues of the empire, and they had even entered into communication with Francis, who basely betrayed them to Charles. On the fourteenth of February, 1540, he entered the city with his body-guard of 4,000 lancers, 1,000 archers, and 5,000 halberdmen and musketeers. He rode in their midst surrounded by "cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and other

great ecclesiastical lords." "The terrors of the Church were combined with the panoply of war to affright the souls of the turbulent burghers." Charles allowed a month to intervene between his arrival in the city and the moment of his vengeance. Then the spell was broken by the execution of nineteen persons, who were beheaded as ringleaders. Then the imperial decree was read confiscating the whole city to the crown. Everything, rents, revenue, houses, munitions of war, was taken. It was further decreed that the senators, their pensionaries, clerks, thirty nobles, to be named by the emperor, with the great dean and second dean of the weavers, all dressed in black robes and bareheaded, should appear upon an appointed day, in company with fifty persons from the guilds, and fifty others to be arbitrarily named, in their shirts, with halters about their necks. This large number of representatives of the city were to fall upon their knees before the emperor, and humbly implore him for the sake of the Passion of Jesus Christ to grant them mercy and forgiveness. This humiliating decree was carried into effect on the third of May, 1540, after which Charles with a "fine show of benignity" gracefully granted his pardon to the citizens. The constitution of the city was annulled and the government placed entirely under persons appointed by the emperor.

In the next year Charles was engaged in a war with the corsairs of North Africa, in which his fleet was dispersed by a tempest, many of the vessels being wrecked. Francis renewed his alliances with the Turks, and Charles found foes on every side. For the next four years he was forced to be continually at war. At length a fresh compromise with the Protestant princes enabled him to invade Champagne with a powerful German army, which so alarmed the French capital that Francis hastened to conclude the peace of Crespy (1544).

This peace with Francis, and a truce subsequently concluded with the Sultan Soliman, left Charles free to engage in his last and greatest labor of love, the suppression of the Reformation. The religious question always lay very near to the heart of the emperor, which was shown in his "paternal"

treatment of his Netherland subjects. But during the first twenty-five years of his reign it was only at intervals that he could indulge in his favorite schemes of missionary enterprises. True, he had found time to establish the Inquisition in the Netherlands, and to issue his edicts in the short intervals between his foreign wars, but it was not until now that he could devote his whole time and vast resources to crushing the viper of heresy which had coiled around the heart of his empire. But the Reformation had grown too strong for even his imperial will. However, he was not one to be easily daunted, and he saw that the time had come to put forth his most strenuous efforts. Accordingly, in 1541, a council had been held at Ratisbon; but owing to differences of opinion as to the powers of the Church and the dogma of transubstantiation, very little was accomplished. The Council of Trent only widened the chasm between the old and the new. Perceiving that mild methods were of no avail, Charles made preparations to compel the obedience of the Protestant princes. He began, as usual, with intrigue and dissimulation. Winning Maurice by agreeing to give him the electorate of Saxony, he began the subjugation of southern Germany. Maurice invaded the territories of electoral Saxony, compelled the elector to withdraw from the Protestant camp, which, consequently, soon broke up, leaving Charles to exercise his "paternal" method in expelling heresy from Cologne. His treatment of Philip of Hesse, whom he shortly afterwards captured, was dishonorable in the extreme, and excited the indignation of Maurice, who was son-in-law to the landgrave.

Elated by his victories to an extent not to be expected of so old a politician, the emperor now adopted some very doubtful measures. Under his auspices the Augsburg Interim was framed—an attempt to supply a common religious platform, which should be binding only until a general council was held. But it pleased neither party. The Catholics rejected it entirely, and the Protestants accorded it only a limited and enforced obedience. He next endeavored to induce the German electors to cancel the election of his

brother, Ferdinand, king of the Romans, and choose his own son. Philip, instead, and, if possible, make the crown hereditary in his own family. But this darling dream was doomed never to be realized.

At the Diet of Augsburg, in 1550, as a recapitulation and condensation of his previous ordinances, Charles issued the following edict. By its style and title it was perpetual, and, according to one of its clauses, was to be published every six months, forever, in every city and village in the Netherlands. Its severity so appalled the queen of Hungary that she made a journey to Augsburg expressly to procure a mitigation of some of its provisions. The principal alteration she was able to obtain, however, was the substitution of the words "spiritual judges" for "inquisitors" wherever that expression occurred. Thus runs this Christian document:

"No one shall print, write, copy, keep, conceal, sell, buy, or give in churches, streets, or other places, any book or writing made by Martin Luther, John Ecolampadius, Ulrich Zwinglius, Martin Bucer, John Calvin, or other heretics reprobated by the Holy Church; . . . nor break or otherwise injure the images of the Holy Virgin or canonized saints; . . . nor in his house hold conventicles, or illegal gatherings, or be present at any such in which the adherents of the above-mentioned heretics teach, baptize, and form conspiracies against the Holy Church and the general welfare. . . . Moreover, we forbid all lay persons *to converse or dispute concerning the holy Scripture*, openly or secretly, especially on any doubtful or difficult matters, or to *read, teach, or expound the Scriptures*, unless they have duly studied theology and been approved by some renowned university; . . . or to preach secretly or openly, or to *entertain any of the opinions* of the above-mentioned heretics; . . . on pain, should any one be found to have contravened any of the points above mentioned, as perturbators of our state and of the general quiet, to be punished in the following manner:"

The edict then goes on to provide the penalties suitable for punishing such damnable treason as holding "any opinions" contrary to the mother Church. It continues:

"That such perturbators of the general quiet are to be executed, to wit: the men with the sword, and the women to be buried alive, if they *do not* persist in their errors; if they *do* persist in them, then they are to be executed with fire; all their property in both cases to be confiscated to the crown."

In this last clause the generous magnanimity of the emperor was displayed, and the toleration of religious opinions with which he has been credited was illustrated.

The edict provides against misprision of heresy in language perfectly intelligible: "We forbid," said the decree, "all persons to lodge, entertain, furnish with food, fire, or clothing, or otherwise to favor any one holden or notoriously suspected of being a heretic; . . . and any one failing to denounce any such, we ordain, shall be liable to the above-mentioned punishments."

The edict further provides, "That if any person, being not convicted of heresy or error, but greatly suspected thereof, and therefore condemned by the spiritual judge to abjure such heresy, or by the secular magistrate to make public fine and reparation, shall again become suspected or tainted with heresy—*although it should not appear that he has contravened* or violated *any one of the above-mentioned commands*—nevertheless, we do will and ordain that such person shall be considered as relapsed, and, as such, be *punished with loss of life* and property, without any hope of moderation or mitigation of the above-mentioned penalties."

Furthermore, it was decreed, "That all who know of any person tainted with heresy are required to denounce and give them up to all judges, officers of the bishops, or others having authority on the premises, on pain of being punished according to the pleasure of the judge. Likewise, all shall be obliged, who know of any place where such heretics keep themselves, to declare them to the authorities, on pain of

being held as accomplices, and punished, as such heretics themselves would be, if apprehended."

It was also ordained, "That the informer, in case of conviction, should be entitled to one-half the property of the accused, if not more than one hundred pounds Flemish: if more, then ten per cent of all such excess."

Treachery was encouraged by the provision, "That if any man being present at any secret conventicle, shall afterwards come forward and betray his fellow-members of the congregation, he shall receive full pardon."

To convince his subjects that these edicts were not promulgated to terrify but to punish heretics, he further ordained that no one, of whatsoever condition, should ask of him, or of "any one having authority," to grant pardon to condemned heretics, "on penalty of being declared forever incapable of civil and military office, and of being arbitrarily punished besides."

While Charles was thus engaged in his congenial religious labors, a plot all unknown to him, was maturing, by which he was to be hurled from his proud position. Maurice of Saxony obtained command of the imperial army, and was employed to compel the citizens of Magdeburg to submit to the Interim. Accomplishing this, he delayed, under various pretexts, to disband his army. He next obtained the support of Henry II., who had succeeded his father in France. Then, backed by 25,000 troops, he boldly published a manifesto against the emperor. Absorbed at Innspruck with the deliberations of the Council of Trent, Charles had not heeded the mutterings of the tempest rapidly approaching. While he was preparing to crush forever the Protestant Church, the rapid and desperate Maurice dashed through the mountain passes at the head of his lancers. Disguised as an old woman, the emperor escaped in a peasant's cart into Flanders. The peace of Passau, in the following August, crushed the whole fabric of the emperor's toil, and laid the foundation of the Protestant Church.

Disappointed in his schemes, broken in his fortunes, all his affairs in confusion, failing in mental powers, it was time for him to retire. He had long contemplated abdicating the throne before death should take it from him, and now was the most appropriate time. At Brussels, in a ducal palace that had withstood the tempests of time for nearly three hundred years, on the twenty-fifth day of October, 1555, the States-general were convened to witness his abdication. He was then fifty-five years and eight months old, but he was already decrepit with premature old age. In feature he was extremely ugly. The royal personages being seated upon chairs placed triangularly under the canopy, such of the audience as had seats provided for them took their places and the proceedings commenced. Philibert de Bruxelles, a member of the Privy Council of the Netherlands, arose at the emperor's command, and made a long oration. He spoke of the emperor's warm affection for the provinces as the land of his birth, and of his deep regret that his failing powers, both of mind and body, rendered it necessary for him to resign his sovereignty. He rejoiced, however, that his son was both vigorous and experienced. After recounting the emperor's numerous triumphs over his armed foes, Philibert referred again to his boundless love for his subjects, and concluded with a tremendous but needless exhortation to Philip on the necessity of maintaining the Catholic religion it its purity. Then the emperor arose, and leaning upon his crutch and the shoulder of the Prince of Orange, who was afterwards the most deadly foe of Philip and the deliverer of the Netherlands, he made a speech which, in intense pathos and unlimited love, has never been surpassed. It so affected his audience that many wept. It was a touching drama, and the completest farce ever enacted on a royal stage. For what was Charles to the Netherlands that they should weep for him? His conduct towards them had been one of unmitigated cruelty and oppression. The edicts and the Inquisition were his only return for their constant obedience and wasted treasures. His was the hand that planted in the heart of the Nether-

lands the poisoned arrows of popery. Under him the scaffold had never been empty, the Inquisition never without a victim. The fires of intolerance lighted up the whole land. The number of Netherlanders who were burned, beheaded, strangled, or buried alive, in obedience to his edicts, and for the offenses of reading the Scriptures, of looking askance at a graven image, or of ridiculing the actual presence of the body and blood of Christ in a wafer, have been placed as high as one hundred thousand by distinguished authorities, and have never been put at a lower mark than fifty thousand. The Venetian envoy, Navigero, placed the number of victims in the provinces of Holland and Friesland alone at thirty thousand. To eradicate the Inquisition and the edicts after they had been fostered by his successor, required the work of an eighty years' war, in the course of which millions of lives were sacrificed. Charles regarded the Netherlands merely as a treasury upon which to draw, and the sums he extorted from them were spent in senseless wars which were of no more interest to them than if they had been waged in another planet.

The same year in which he enacted this hypocritical drama he intimated to his brother Ferdinand his determination to resign the imperial dignity, but it was not until 1558 that the formal process of abdication was completed. After his renunciation of power, he settled at Yuste, a Hieronymite monastery in the north of Estremadura. Here he remained until his death. His life in retirement has been poetically pictured by various authors, but modern historians have torn the misty shroud of romance from it and laid it bare in its actual and rather prosaic reality. "He had neither the taste nor talent which make a man great in retirement. Not a lofty thought, not a generous sentiment, not a profound or acute suggestion in his retreat has been recorded from his lips. The epigrams which had been invented for him by fabalists have all been taken away, and nothing has been substituted save a few stale jests exchanged with stupid friars." His last energies were spent in completing that system of

religious cruelty which set one-half of Christendom against the other, drenched the fairest countries of the world in blood, and permanently arrested the civilization of southern Europe. He regretted that respect for human engagements had constrained him to let "that arch-heretic," Luther, escape from the Diet of Worms, but congratulated himself that he had never exposed his soul to contamination by hearing the new doctrine defended in his presence. He issued fierce instructions from his retreat to the inquisitors to hasten the execution of all heretics—particularly those of his ancient friends, preachers, and almoners, Cazalla and Constantine de Fuente. He furiously exhorted Philip—as if Philip needed to be prompted in such a work—to set himself to "cutting out the root of heresy with vigor and rude chastisement." Such explosions of savage bigotry as these, alternating with exhibitions of revolting gluttony, compose a spectacle less attractive to the imagination than the ancient portrait of the cloistered Charles.

He died as became a sincere Catholic, commending his soul to his God, on the morning of September 21, 1558. As the shadows of night receded from the earth, they bore with them the life of a man who had at all times zealously championed the cause of the Church, even to murdering his fellow-beings. Could the scattered dust of his victims be gathered from the graves into which they had been thrust alive by his edicts, there would be a ghostly army thousands strong to testify to the inhuman cruelty of the greatest emperor of the sixteenth century.

PHILIP II.

PHILIP II., the "Demon of the South," was a crowned cut-throat. He was the only legitimate son of the Emperor Charles V., who left him the kingdom of Spain and her dependencies on his abdication in 1555. His whole life was spent in an endeavor, however vain, to suppress the Reformation and exterminate the reformers. His robber father had left him his kingdom with the injunction to preserve, in all its purity, the holy Catholic faith; but Philip needed no encouragement in a work so congenial to his nature. His thirst for the lives of heretics was unquenchable. "It is probable," says Lafuente the Spanish historian, "that had the Inquisition not existed, he would have invented it." Certainly no inquisitor was ever more cruel than he, no fanatic more zealous in spreading the gospel of Christ. He used all his energies, all the power and wealth of his vast possessions, to accomplish his darling dream of murdering all Protestants. He conceived and plotted for the massacre of St. Bartholomew seventeen years before the hellish deed was done. Had it not been for the timely warning given the prince of Orange by the French monarch who, with misplaced confidence, laid bare Philip's plot to his silent listener, he would have murdered all his Protestant subjects with the same mercilessness. But although he could not sacrifice them at one blow, yet by patient vindictiveness and never-ceasing cruelty he managed in the course of his reign to convert his kingdom into a cemetery, in which reposed the tortured bodies of hundreds of thousands of victims executed upon the scaffold, at the stake, or starved in dungeons. He was the grand inquisitor, the chief familiar, of the Inquisition. Under his imperi-

ous rule the Cortes became a ridiculous nullity and all constitutional guarantees of liberty were ruthlessly swept away. Ignorant of the art of statesmanship, he, by a systematic course of dissimulation, bent before his iron will the oldest and proudest nobles of Spain. His were the coward's weapons, lies and treachery. Too weak to draw the sword himself, he kept in his service hired assassins and salaried butchers of human beings. When credit is given to whom credit is due, and the things which are Cæsar's shall be given to Cæsar, to Philip of Spain will be awarded the horrible honor of the massacre of St. Bartholomew; the merit, great in the eyes of Christians, of heaping human fuel on the smouldering fires lighted by his father, and the glory of perfecting the Inquisition. He crushed the liberties of Spain, drove the low lands to revolt, and laid his iron grasp upon the throat of the New World. Hidden in the depths of his half-monkish, half-royal den, like a spider bloated with blood—a serpent coiled in its slime—concealing the king beneath the garb of a monk, he wove with the patience of a fiend the misty shrouds for a million burials and turned the sod for uncounted graves.

He was born in May, 1527. At the age of sixteen he married his cousin, Maria of Portugal. In the following year he became father of the ill-starred Don Carlos, and a widower. In 1548 he visited for the first time the Netherland provinces, to receive the homage of the honest burghers as their future sovereign. In return for their fealty he promised to support the various constitutions and charters—promises which he broke as readily as he made. In 1554 he married his second wife, the queen of England, Mary Tudor, at Winchester. If congeniality of tastes could have made a marriage happy, the very rocks should have laughed in glee over this one. To maintain the supremacy of the Church seemed to both the main object of existence: to execute unbelievers, the most sacred duty imposed upon princes; to convert their kingdoms into a hell for their subjects, the surest means of winning heaven for themselves.

He inherited from his father all the Spanish kingdoms and

both the Sicilies. He was titular king of England, France, and Jerusalem. He was "Absolute Dominator" in Asia, Africa, and America; he was Duke of Milan and of both Burgundies, and Hereditary Sovereign of the seventeen Netherlands. In person he was small and meagre, much below the middle height, with thin legs, narrow chest, and the timid, shrinking air of an habitual sneak. In disposition he was taciturn, silent, sombre, just what one would imagine a man to be who never performed a generous deed in his life and whose thoughts were continually of murder—a fit companion for the fiends and furies of a nether world. The fierce enthusiasm for the cross, which in a long warfare against the cresent had been the distinguishing characteristic of the Spanish character, had degenerated into bigotry, intensified by time, and Philip was to be the latest and most perfect incarnation of this perpetual hate. He regarded the Christian heretic with even a more intense hatred than had been felt for Jew or Moor in the most Christian ages. He was by birth, education, and character, a Spaniard, and he regarded everybody not of that excessively chivalrous race with the most intense abhorrence.

Upon ascending the throne left him by his father, Philip was immediately involved in war and turmoil. He had a war with France on his hands; one with the pope, which he settled by asking the pope's pardon and giving him a hundred Italian towns taken from the French as a peace-offering; his Netherland provinces were insubordinate, while Portugal and even portions of his own Spain were far from quiet under the gentle rule of the Inquisition. In August, 1557, was fought the battle of St. Quentin, which city was captured by Philip's troops after a desperate resistance. Philip, who had, under the pretense of organizing a larger force, remained in the background until the victory was won, arrived in time to feast his eyes on the dying agonies of the inhabitants. The sack of the city lasted two days. The town was fired in a hundred places. The streets were strewn with the corpses of the murdered garrison and citizens, while the survivors were

burning in their houses. The women were stripped naked lest they should conceal treasures which should belong to the conquerors, and they were slashed in the face with knives, and many had their arms cut off. On the twenty-ninth the sack was considered by Philip to be complete, and he ordered that every woman, without an exception, should be driven from the city into the French territory. Everybody who spoke the French language was to be expelled. The tongues of the men had been effectually silenced, and the women, to the number of thirty-five hundred, were now compelled to leave the city. Some were starving, others had been desperately wounded, all were obliged to tread upon the bodies of husbands, brothers, or relations, as they took up their funeral march, escorted by bodies of heavily armed troopers. This expulsion of the women was by the express command of Philip, who had made no effort to stay the scene of death enacted under his royal eyes. He had, however, not forgotten his duty to the saints. As soon as the conflagration had started, he sent to the cathedral and caused the bones of St. Quentin to be removed to the royal tent. Here he built an altar, placing the skeleton on one side, and on the other the head of the "glorious St. Gregory" (whoever he may have been); fenced the whole lot in with a gilded rail, and had "many masses" said daily for the repose of their souls. Theoretical religion held sway in the monarch's tent; outside its workings were exemplified in a practical manner.

After a second victory, that of Gravelines, a treaty of peace most dishonorable for France was dictated by Philip, who obtained besides a promise from the French monarch, Henry II., that he would murder all the Protestants in his dominions. This was the origination of the St. Bartholomew massacre. For this promise of the French king, Philip refrained from marching on to Paris—a course which displeased everybody who did not understand the hidden motive which influenced Philip's action, and caused the secluded Charles V. to swear most fearfully.

The battle of Gravelines had settled the question for the

French king, and he was weary of fighting. Philip had no taste for glories won in honorable, however foolish, combat, and was anxious to concentrate his whole mind and the power of his kingdom upon the Netherland heresies which had been steadily spreading since the iron hand of Charles had been removed. He felt that he could serve his God better by treacherously murdering Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anabaptists than by exposing his precious person to the bullets of the Frenchmen. Accordingly negotiations were again opened for peace. The death of Mary, Philip's wife, occurring, caused a temporary suspension of proceedings, but they were resumed immediately after Philip had made a fruitless attempt to obtain the hand of her successor. On the third of April, 1559, a treaty was concluded between France and Spain, called the treaty of Cateau Cambresis. By its provisions both kings bound themselves to maintain the Catholic worship inviolate by all means in their power—and after events proved their power to be not inconsiderable—and agreed that an œcumenical council should at once assemble to compose the religious differences and to extinguish the increasing heresy in both kingdoms. It was also arranged that the conquests made by each country during the preceding eight years should be restored. Henry died before he could compose his religious differences with the Huguenots, but Charles IX. fulfilled to the letter Henry's promise to Philip.

Pending the peace negotiations, Philip had been called upon to pay the last tribute to his wife and father. His wife he hated, although her love for him was the only bright spot in a character otherwise worthy only of execration. He did not affect grief at her demise, but he honored his father's memory with stately obsequies at Brussels, whither he went in his own saintly royal person. The ceremonies lasted two days, the twenty-ninth and thirtieth of December, 1558. In the elaborate procession which swept through the streets upon the first day the most conspicuous object was a ship floating upon mimic waves. The standing rigging and sails were black, it was covered with heraldic devices, shields, ban-

ners, and trophies of the emperor's many campaigns, while the flags of the Turks and Moors trailed from her sides in the waves below. Three allegorical personages composed the crew. Hope, all "clothyd in brown, with anker in hand," stood at the prow; Faith, with sacramental chalice and red cross, clad in white garments, with her face veiled "with white tiffany," sat on a "stool of estate" before the mizzen-mast; while Charity, "in red, holding in her hand a burning heart," was at the helm to steer the vessel. Hope, Faith, and Charity were the emblems chosen by the pious son to honor the memory of a father whose great work had been the suppression of heresy, who had invented the edicts, fostered the Inquisition, and whose last words were an injunction to his son to deal to all heretics the extreme penalty of the law, "without respect of persons and without regard to any plea in their favor."

Philip lingered in the Netherlands till the next summer. He appeared in state on several solemn occasions to impress upon the country the necessity of attending to the great subject with which his mind was exclusively occupied. He came before the great council of Mechlin in order to address that body with his own lips upon the necessity of supporting the edicts promulgated by his father, and of trampling out every vestige of heresy, wherever it should appear, by the immediate immolation of all heretics, whoever they might be. He likewise caused the estates of Flanders to be privately assembled, that he might harangue them upon the same great topic. On the seventh of August, 1559, the provinces were convoked at Ghent, there to receive the parting communication of the king. The estates being duly assembled, Philip, attended by Margaret of Parma, the new regent for the provinces, the Duke of Savoy, and a stately retinue of embassadors and grandees, made his appearance before them. After the customary ceremonies had been performed, the bishop of Arras arose and delivered, in the name of his sovereign, an elaborate farewell address, overflowing with love for his subjects. The States were informed by this important harangue

that their king was intending leaving them immediately. He would gladly have remained longer among a people he loved so much, but cruel circumstances forced him to leave them. He had, however, a few words to say to them on the ever-pressing subject of religion, and he wished them to feel that his desires were actuated by the intense love he bore for the provinces, the birthplace of his beloved father. At this moment, went on the royal substitute, many countries, and particularly the lands in the immediate neighborhood, were greatly infested by various "new, reprobate, and damnable sects;" as these sects, proceeding from the foul fiend, father of discord, had not failed to keep those kingdoms in perpetual dissension and misery, to the manifest displeasure of God Almighty; as his majesty was desirous to avert such terrible evils from his own realms, according to his duty to the Lord God, who would demand reckoning from him hereafter for the well-being of his provinces; as his majesty was most desirous of following in the footsteps of his father, therefore his majesty had commanded the Regent Margaret of Parma, "for the sake of religion and the glory of God, *accurately and exactly to cause to be enforced the edicts and decrees made by his imperial majesty, and renewed by his present majesty, for the extirpation of all sects and heresies.* All having authority were instructed to do their utmost to accomplish this great end."

This was the chief object of the harangue. A few rhetorical paragraphs were added on the administration of justice, "without which the republic was a dead body without a soul;" and the discourse concluded with an earnest exhortation to the provinces to stamp heretics and heresies out of existence, with the assurance that in such case the Lord God would bestow upon them health and happiness.

On the same day in which the estates had assembled at Ghent, Philip addressed an elaborate letter to the great council of Mechlin, and other courts and councils of the provinces, the object of which was to communicate to them his final commands in regard to the edicts, and ordering the execution of all heretics in the most summary manner. He

gave stringent instructions that these decrees for burning, strangling, and burying alive, should be fulfilled to the letter. He ordered all officers "to be curious to inquire on all sides as to the execution of the placards," stating his desire "that the utmost rigor should be employed without any respect of persons," and that not only "the transgressors should be proceeded against, but also the judges who should prove remiss in their prosecution of heretics." He stated that an opinion had got abroad that the edicts were only for Anabaptists, and he wished to undeceive his dear people. They were to be "enforced against all sectaries, without any distinction or mercy, who might be spotted merely with the errors introduced by Luther."

Soon after the adjournment of the assembly, Philip completed his preparations for his departure. He went to Flushing, whence his fleet was to sail, and on the twenty-sixth of August, 1559, embarked for Spain. The fleet consisted of ninety vessels, and was laden with the spoils accumulated by Charles and Philip. The voyage proved so tempestuous that much of the valuable lading was thrown overboard. Philip had determined to fix the hitherto wandering capital of his dominions in Spain, and fixed upon Madrid as the proper place. Upon landing at Laredo, he praised God and the saints, who, he said, had him in their keeping, for preserving him from the perils of the sea, and saw in his escape from imminent peril a confirmation by the Lord of the great purpose to which he had consecrated his existence. Many are called, but few are chosen, and Philip felt that he was one of the few. To him had been confided the mighty mission of preserving the purity of the one true faith, and he would not prove recusant to the pious trust. That his heart might not grow faint by the way, he deemed it necessary to feast his eyes upon the dying struggles of a few burning heretics, and, accordingly, he ordered an *auto da fé*.

An *auto da fé* had been consummated at Valladolid on the twenty-first of May, 1559, in the absence of the king, but in the presence of the royal family. Another one was now to be

held in honor of the return of the king. Upon the eighth of October it took place. "The king, with his sister and his son, the high officers of state, the foreign ministers, and all the nobility of the kingdom, were present, together with an immense concourse of soldiery, clergy, and populace. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of Cuença. When it was finished Inquisitor-General Valdez cried with a loud voice, 'O God, make speed to help us.' The king then drew his sword. Valdez, advancing to the platform upon which Philip was seated, proceeded to read the protestation: 'Your Majesty swears by the cross of the sword whereon your royal hand reposes, that you will give all necessary favor to the Holy Office of the Inquisition against heretics, apostates, and those who favor them, and will denounce and inform against all those who, to your royal knowledge, shall act or speak against the faith.' The king answered aloud, 'I swear it,' and signed the paper. The oath was read to the whole assembly by an officer of the Inquisition. Thirteen distinguished victims were then burned before the monarch's eyes, besides one body which a friendly death had snatched from the hands of the Holy Office and the effigy of another person who had been condemned, although not yet tried or even apprehended. Among the sufferers was Carlos de Sessa, a young noble of distinguished character and abilities, who said to the king as he passed by the throne to the stake, 'How can you thus look on and permit me to be burned?' Philip then made the memorable reply, carefully recorded by his historiographer and panegyrist: 'I would carry the wood to burn my own son withal, were he as wicked as you.'"

Perhaps Philip considered the ill-fated Don Carlos, his own son, as wicked as the young Sessa, and although he did not carry wood to burn him, there is hardly any doubt that he carried the poison which put to sleep a very restless and dangerous young man.

Philip attended shortly afterwards another "act of faith" at Seville, in which fifty living heretics were burned, besides the bones of Doctor Constantine Ponce de la Fuente, once the

friend, chaplain, and almoner of Philip's father. Besides burning his bones, the Holy Office "also wreaked an impotent and ludicrous malice upon his effigy." A stuffed figure, attired in his robes, was placed upon the scaffold among the living victims, and then cast into the flames.

Such were the ceremonies by which this Christian king returned thanks to his God for his miraculous preservation from shipwreck, and such were the sights that greeted his new queen, Isabella of France, on assuming the duties of a wife. "These charred and shriveled victims, burning at the stake, were the torch which lighted the royal pair to their nuptial couch."

Philip had returned to Spain determined to extirpate heresy by extirpating the heretics. The edicts and the placards given by his father to the Netherlands were rigorously enforced. The Inquisition was kept busy, and a dozen new bishopries created and filled by the pope, each bishop being head inquisitor for his district. Inquisitorial agents were appointed by them, scaffolds were erected, stakes planted, dungeons built, and everything possible was done to win the erring children back to the bosom of their mother Church. The inquisitors were ordered to "make it known that they were not doing their own work but that of Christ, and to persuade all persons of this fact." Among the inquisitors set at this infamous work by Philip, Peter Titelmann was the nearest akin to a fiend. He was called "Saul the persecutor," because he had formerly been tainted with the heresy he was now so zealous in suppressing. Flanders, Douay, and Tournay, the most populous portions of the Netherlands, were the vineyard given him by his master in which to labor to bring wayward heretics to love and respect the one true faith. Contemporary chronicles give a picture of him as of "some grotesque yet terrible goblin, careering through the country by night or day, alone, on horseback, smiting the trembling peasants on the head with a great club, spreading dismay far and wide, dragging suspected persons from their firesides or their beds, and thrusting them into dungeons, arresting, tortur-

ing, strangling, burning, with hardly the shadow of warrant, information, or process."

The secular sheriff, meeting this inquisitor, Titelmann, one day upon the high road, thus inquiringly addressed him: "How can you venture to go about alone, or at most with an attendant or two, arresting people on every side, while I dare not attempt to execute my office except at the head of a strong force, armed in proof, and then only at the peril of my life?"

"Ah! Red-Rod," answered Peter, jocosely, "you deal with bad people. I have nothing to fear, for I seize only the innocent and virtuous, who make no resistance, and let themselves be taken like lambs."

"Mighty well," said the other; "but if you arrest all the good people, and I all the bad, 'tis difficult to say who in the world is to escape chastisement."

Titelmann was the most active of all the agents in the religious persecutions at this time, but he had held his office for many years. "The martyrology of the provinces reeks with his murders. He burned men for idle words or suspected thoughts; he rarely waited, according to his frank confession, for deeds." Hearing once that a certain schoolmaster was "addicted to reading the Bible," he summoned him before him, and proceeded to catechise him. The schoolmaster soon convicted himself by his admissions of his doubts upon the dogmas of the Church. Titelmann commanded him to recant. He refused. "Do you not love your wife and children?" asked the fiendish inquisitor. "If the whole world were of gold and my own," answered the heroic heretic, "I would give it all only to have them with me, even had I to live on bread and water and in bondage." "You have, then, only to renounce the error of your opinions," responded the churchman. "Neither for wife, children, nor all the world, can I renounce my belief," answered the prisoner. Thereupon Titelmann condemned him to be burned. He was strangled, and then thrown into the flames.

About the same time a tapestry weaver of Tournay,

Thomas Calberg, was convicted of having copied some hymns from a book printed in Geneva. Titelmann burned him alive. Another man, for the horrible crime of being an Anabaptist, was hacked to death with seven blows of a rusty sword, in the presence of his wife, who was so horror-stricken that she died on the spot before her husband. In the same year Walter Kapell, a man of considerable property and noted for his charities, was burned at the stake for his heretical opinions. At Tournay, one of the cities in Titelmann's district, Bertrand le Blas, a velvet manufacturer, for having broken and trampled upon a wafer, supposed to be the body of Christ, suffered a terrible punishment. He was put thrice to the torture, after which he was dragged on a hurdle, with his mouth closed with an iron gag, to the market-place. Here his right hand and foot were burned and twisted off between two red-hot irons. His tongue was then torn out by the roots. With his arms and legs fastened together behind his back, he was hooked by the middle of his body to an iron chain, and made to swing to and fro over a slow fire till he was entirely roasted. His life lasted almost to the end of these ingenious tortures. Titelmann also caused the arrest of a Protestant family, Robert Ogier, his wife, and two sons. The father and the eldest son were immediately condemned to the stake. "Oh, God!" prayed the youth, writhing in the flames, "Eternal Father, accept the sacrifice of our lives, in the name of thy beloved Son." "Thou liest, scoundrel!" fiercely interrupted a monk, who was heaping fuel upon the fire; "God is not your father; ye are the devil's children." As the hot flames rose higher about them, the poor boy, losing his senses, once more cried out: "Look, my father, all heaven is opening, and I see ten hundred thousand angels rejoicing over us. Let us be glad, for we are dying for the truth." "Thou liest! Thou liest!" again screamed the monk; "all hell is opening, and you see ten thousand devils thrusting you into eternal fire." Eight days afterwards, Titelmann made an end of that family by burning Ogier's wife and remaining son.

At the same time he broke into a house in Ryssel, seized John de Swathe, his wife and four children, together with two newly-married couples, and two other persons, convicted them of reading the Bible, and had them all immediately burned.

Inasmuch as reading the Bible made men the heartless persecutors here recorded, and as men, women, and children were burned for poring over its musty pages, stained with records of murders, rapes, and robberies, who shall say that the world would not have been better had that ancient book not been preserved?

These entries are taken from an account-book—the register of municipal expenses at Tournay—and were paid by the government of Philip, one of the few instances in which he paid debts contracted by his orders, and which he probably would not have done had they not been incurred in a cause which commanded his warmest sympathies: "To Mr. Jacques Barra, executioner, for having tortured, twice, Jean de Lannoy, ten sous. To the same, for having executed by fire said Lannoy, sixty sous. For having thrown his cinders into the river, eight sous."

This was the treatment to which Philip subjected thousands and tens of thousands in the provinces. He sat in his apartment at Madrid and issued the orders which burned, beheaded, strangled. His familiars glided through every household and coiled themselves at every fireside. No heretic could escape discovery. Philip himself avowed the Inquisition in the Netherlands to be "*much more pitiless than that of Spain.*"

This system of religious persecution pursued by Philip, illustrated by sketching a few of the demoniacal acts of a sub-inquisitor, was invented by Charles V., but brought to perfection by him, and to him belongs the responsibility for the unutterable woe caused by the continuance of the hellish scheme. Titelmann and the other inquisitors were stimulated by his orders, and it was under the edicts re-promulgated by him that they acted. It was not the fault of Philip that every heretic in the Netherlands was not exterminated. In

a country where everybody except the nobles and governing powers were tainted with heresy it was no easy matter to find and punish them all. The Lutherans and Calvinists now began to assemble in armed bodies in the open air to listen to the doctrines of the reformers, and the royal troops were sent to disperse them. The Protestant preachers recited the valiant deeds of Joshua, Judas Maccabeus, and other Bible heroes, put a good deal of trust in God, and entreated their followers to resist to the last. One Pierre Cornaille, a locksmith and Calvinist preacher, collected a force of nearly three thousand rustics, young students, and mechanics, at Lannoy, and announced his determination to hold the fort against the enemies of his so-called God. Philip dispatched one of his generals, Noircarmes, to convert him and his followers back to the Catholic faith. Noircarmes destroyed half of them at the very first charge. The preacher fought well, but his undisciplined force could not oppose the trained troops of Philip. A thousand were soon stretched upon the field dead: others were hunted into the river. According to the Catholic accounts, twenty-six hundred were killed within an hour.

The siege and capture of the city of Valenciennes, in which some Huguenots (Calvinists) had taken refuge, by Noircarmes soon followed. The city was treacherously sacked and many of its citizens, men and women, put to the torture. The revolution was breaking out. All these acts of resistance to his tyranny only inflamed Philip the more. He swore, "By the soul of my father it shall cost them dear," and he prepared to execute his threat.

One of his first acts was the treacherous murder through Alva of the Counts Egmont and Horn. Even Catholic historians and writers, usually so prolific in excuses for the atrocities committed by children of the Church, do not attempt to extenuate the horrible treachery of Philip in this transaction. Archbishop Spalding, although glossing many Catholic crimes with sophistical complacency, says of him: "But there was one atrocity committed by Alva and fully sanctioned, if not expressly commanded by Philip, which no

consideration can ever excuse or even palliate in the slightest degree. We refer to the judicial murder of the brilliant, the noble, the chivalric Catholic Count Egmont, and of the two noble Catholic brothers, Counts Horn and Montigny. The two former were executed at Brussels under Alva; while Montigny, who had been sent by Margaret [the regent of the provinces] on an important embassy to Spain, was there detained several years by Philip, and was finally secretly executed by order of the implacable monarch on his hearing of the outbreak of the religious fanatics."

We now know, however, through the indefatigable labors of one of the world's best and greatest historians, the lamented John Lothrop Motley, that although Alva, the hunter of human beings, was the executor of the infamous deed, the same brain which conceived the massacre of Bartholomew plotted the destruction of the three counts. When Alva went on his mission of death to the Netherlands, he carried in his pocket the death-warrants, signed in blank, of the devoted nobles. Philip set his hound on, and the dog faithfully obeyed his master. Kick the cur if you like, but don't forget to chastise its owner.

Philip dispatched Alva to the provinces to subdue them, and while that man of wrath is laying waste the populous countries, and burning, beheading, burying alive, and strangling the unfortunate inhabitants (an account of which will be found in the sketch of the Duke) we will glance at the work of Philip in other parts of his possessions.

His greatest success in religious matters was the re-convocation of the Council of Trent, which had been suspended so often, and which had encountered so many difficulties in the accomplishment of the object of its meeting. The labors, however, of the learned prelates who composed that council had terminated much to the satisfaction of Philip, and the chains for the minds of men had been forged and the last link welded. Using the terrific engines of the Inquisition, he had smothered heresy in Spain, although it was defiant in every other part of Europe where it had found foothold.

In his administration of the internal affairs of his kingdom he was singularly unfortunate. He had not even the talent of a money-broker. Indeed, Voltaire regarded him as a man of little resource, a mere mischief-maker, a royal busy-body, who, for half a century, kept Europe in an uproar, without accomplishing anything worthy of even a much smaller potentate. The resources of the State were exhausted by continued wars and improvident management. Commerce and industry were paralyzed, almost dead, the population was greatly diminished, the public debt enormous, and the financial resources exhausted. To remedy these deficiencies, Philip had recourse to forced loans, sales of patents of nobility, and confiscations.

Heresy had gained a slight foothold in Spain, and Charles, with fierce zeal, wrote to Philip that he would leave his retreat at Yuste and come forth to crush the monster if prompt measures were not taken to suppress it. But Philip needed no such stimulation, and had Charles lived a few years longer he would have been fully content with his pious son's exertions to extirpate heresy from his dominions. He would have been amazed at witnessing the ferocious impartiality with which the Inquisition seized upon the high and the low. It laid its iron hand upon a primate who had written commentaries or upon a servant suspected of heresy, with equal respect. Even churchmen were not sacred in Philip's eyes unless they were sound on the sacred dogmas. He measured everybody by his half bushel, and if they were too large, he took off their heads to get them in, having first rendered them supple by stretching their joints on the rack. The *autos da fé* were his especial delight, and continued during his reign to be a characteristic feature of Spanish chivalry.

He has been spoken of by some historians as a patron of the arts and literature, but no act of his can be found to sustain the statement. His whole life gives it the lie direct. In the beginning of his reign he issued the decree that none of his subjects, without any exception whatever, should leave the kingdom "to learn or to teach, or to read anything," or

even to reside in any of the universities, colleges, or schools established in foreign parts. To those who were thus engaged he prescribed that they should return home within four months. Any ecclesiastic violating this decree was to be denationalized and lose all his temporalities; any layman was to be punished with the confiscation of his property and perpetual exile.

As the only ones who knew anything had been driven out of Spain, and as the Inquisition stood ready to torture anybody who pretended to know anything, it will be seen how carefully Philip had planned to conserve learning. A few more such conservators and the world would be obliged to start anew.

Philip seems to have exhausted his imagination in his efforts to make life intolerable to the unfortunate Moors of Granada. Not content with forcing them to abjure their religion, and with oppressing them with every conceivable sort of oppression, including the Inquisition, and the "acts of faith," he at last forbade them under the most terrible penalties, to speak their own language. They were ordered to speak Spanish only, whether they knew it or not. If they didn't speak it, they had to walk it. It was none of Philip's business that they didn't know Spanish from Greek. They must learn the language of the gentle king in a moment or die, and a great many of them died learning it.

While the Moors were filling Granada with the horrors of a fanatical war caused by this edict of Philip, occurred the arrest and secret trial of Don Carlos, his son and hereditary heir to the throne. Over the death of this prince there hangs, and must forever remain, the shadow of mystery. Most historians unite in saying that Philip poisoned his son; and, considering his character and capabilities in this style of statesmanship, there is but little room to doubt it. The Prince of Orange, in his famous Apology, calls Philip the murderer of his wife and of his son, and says there was proof of the facts in France. He alludes to the violent death of Carlos almost as if it were an indisputable truth, and

accuses the Inquisition of condemning him. The historian, P. Matthieu, relates that Philip assembled his council of conscience; that they recommended mercy; that thereupon Philip gave the matter to the Inquisition, by which tribunal Carlos was declared a heretic and condemned to death, and that the sentence was executed by four slaves, two of whom held his arms, one his feet, while the fourth strangled him with a small cord. De Thou, however, who gives the story in detail, and as though no doubt whatever existed as to Philip's participation in his son's murder, says that Carlos was forced to swallow a bowl of poisoned broth, from the effects of which he died in a few hours. Philip was certainly an adept in the art of midnight assassination, and he had no scruples against using, in the service of God, the poison, knife, or cord. In one of his letters—he was an almost interminable scrawler of letters, orders, and decrees—to his aunt, Queen Catherine of Portugal, he declared himself, like Abraham, prepared to go all lengths in obedience to the Lord. "I have chosen in this matter," he said, "to make the sacrifice of my own flesh and blood, and to prefer his [God's] service and the universal welfare to all other human considerations." Philip also wrote to the Pope Pius V. upon the subject, and whenever the Vatican is searched, the truth in regard to this dark deed will come out. Philip was afraid of his spiritual superior, and probably told him the truth.

As for the prince himself, we need waste no sympathy on him, whatever his fate. Had he lived, the realms of the Spanish crown would have numbered one tyrant more. From his earliest youth he was remarkable for his ferocity; and wonderful stories are told of his deeds of daring and revengeful cruelty. When a boy, he used to get up private *autos da fé* on his own account, using animals captured in the chase, where his father used heretics. He was prematurely and grossly licentious, and took pleasure in insulting, by coarse words and coarse gestures, respectable females in the street. He once attempted to take the life of the grand inquisitor and of the Duke of Alva, both of whom he cordially hated. He

also endeavored to kill his father, in all of which laudable undertakings, it is to be regretted he did not succeed.

The insurrection of Saragossa in Aragon furnished Philip an opportunity of displaying his wonderful talent for murder. He dispatched Vargas against his rebellious subjects, who were led by Don Juan de Lanuza. Vargas was successful, capturing the Don and his army. Philip gave this order to Vargas in relation to his treatment of the captured general: "You will arrest Don Juan de Lanuza, and you will have his head immediately cut off." This laconic sentence put to death the supreme magistrate of Aragon. The royal vengeance, however, was not satisfied. The death of Don Juan was merely a prelude to the scenes to follow, the bugle-call to clear the floor for the dance of death. The streets of Saragossa were choked with ruins, and the scaffold was slippery with blood. Plebeian and noble, patrician and commoner, old and young, were alike beheaded, without discrimination and with no mercy. Some were beheaded, some strangled, many quartered and disemboweled. Heads were stuck up plentifully in the most conspicuous places of resort, with what was thought to be appropriate inscriptions. Philip closed this bloody work, for which he deserves and gets the thanks of all good Catholics, with something entirely new in such tragical dramas. Before the curtain fell, the hangman was hung by his own aid.

Philip called off his dogs of war only to let loose the snakes of the Inquisition among the people of Aragon. This religious institution in a short time dragged into its dungeons one hundred and thirty persons, who were tortured and burned. On the twentieth of October, 1592, an *auto da fé* took place which lasted from eight o'clock in the morning until nine at night—thirteen hours spent in roasting human beings!

While these scenes were being enacted in Aragon, Philip was not less busy in other parts of his inheritance. Everywhere the Inquisition was at work. He was still engaged in the thirty years' war in the Netherlands, besides innumerable

plots at the courts of his neighbors. His gigantic scheme for the subjugation of England had failed, as well as his plot to poison Elizabeth. His French neighbor was often vacillating, but finally joined Philip in his life work of extirpating heretics, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew followed. Nothing could exceed the satisfaction which that event gave to Philip. "The news of the events upon St. Bartholomew's day," wrote the French envoy at Madrid, Saint Goard, to Charles IX., "arrived on the seventh of September (1572). The king, on receiving the intelligence, showed, contrary to his natural custom, so much gayety that he seemed more delighted than with all the good fortune or happy incidents which had ever before occurred to him. He called all his familiars about him in order to assure them that your majesty was his good brother, and that no one else deserved the title of Most Christian. He sent his secretary, Cayas, to me with his felicitations upon the events, and with the information that he was just going to St. Jerome to render thanks to God, and to offer his prayers that your majesty might receive divine support in this great affair. I went to see him next morning, and, as soon as I came into his presence, *he began to laugh*, and, with demonstrations of extreme contentment, to praise your majesty as deserving your title of Most Christian, telling me there was no king worthy to be your majesty's companion, either for *valor or prudence*. I thanked him," continued the embassador, "and I said that I thanked God for enabling your majesty *to prove to his master that his apprentice had learned his trade, and deserved his title of Most Christian King.*"

Philip was so overjoyed at the demonical work wrought by the French monarch that he wrote to Alva, ordering the immediate execution of a thousand Huguenot prisoners, which order Alva cheerfully obeyed.

It would require volumes to follow Philip in all the devilish details of his reign, and this sketch of a man universally detested must be closed. His cruelty and treachery were in proportion to his piety, which was enormous. He made three ineffectual attempts to murder the Prince of Orange, but the

fourth succeeded. He intrigued against everybody, trusting no one and no one trusting him. His favorite of to-day he killed to-morrow, and his minister of one year was an exile or a corpse the next. During his reign of forty-two years he made no sincere friend, and if he ever did a deed from purely generous impulses, history has yet to record it. As a statesman he was excelled by nearly every one of his own officers: as a soldier he was cautious and cowardly; as a financier, he made a ridiculous failure. Spain degenerated in his reign from her place in the front rank of nations to a dead sea of Christianity. Education was driven beyond her borders; science lay buried in a Moorish grave; literature was exiled; art languished in the gloom of monkish cells. Philip's only capacity lay in his ability to ferret out and murder heretics, and his capabilities as an assassin are undoubted.

He died, covered with ulcers and horrible sores, on the morning of the thirteenth of September, 1598. He had suffered from gout for twenty years before his death, and in the three months preceding that happy event, he was punished most terribly for his many crimes. He died, however, filled with fortitude, faith, and religious hope. He had no remorse whatever for the deeds he had done, and at the recollection of which the whole world shudders. He expressed no regret, no repentance, no contrition. He died firm in the faith, listening to the reading of the Passion of Christ and kissing a senseless cross. His only regret at dying was "that heaven which had granted him so many kingdoms had refused him a son capable of governing them." Perhaps the spectre of Don Carlos was flitting before his dying eyes as he said this: or perhaps the recollection of Orange, Egmont, Horn, and Montigny, came to disturb his rest. For the thousands he had murdered he had no sigh of sympathy; if he saw in his dying dreams the forms of tender women writhing in the flames of *autos da fé*, he gave no sign. Colder than an iceberg, calmer than a statue, heartless as a fiend, he fixed his eyes on an image of his dying savior, and stepped fearlessly into the great forever.

DUKE OF ALVA.

To RECORD the deeds and write the praises of those whose lives were given to doing good, and whose every thought and action was tempered with the desire to advance the welfare of their fellow-beings; to seek for the hidden impulses which moved great men to deeds which have influenced the world; to analyze their motives in works fraught with the gravest consequences, not only to their time and generation, but to the numberless generations to come—these are a labor of love, a task of pleasure, to the conscientious historian. But in gathering the ripened harvest of the ages gone, in winnowing the good from the bad, and placing the golden grain apart from the worthless chaff, one is compelled to handle the tares and thistles which have grown alongside of the wheat in the harvest fields of the world. In all times there have been noble and ignoble men—men who labored for others, and men who thought only of self. With one of the latter we have now to deal.

Ferdinand Alvarez de Toledo, Duke of Alva, was born in 1508, of a family which boasted imperial descent. A Palæologus, brother of a Byzantine emperor, had conquered the city of Toledo, and transmitted its appellation as a family name. The father of Ferdinand, Don Garcia, had fallen on the isle of Gerbes, in battle with the Moors, when his son was but four years of age. The child, a black-haired, bright-eyed little fellow, was brought up by his grandfather, Don Frederick, and trained from his tenderest infancy to arms. He drew in the martial spirit with his mother's milk, and it was encouraged to the utmost in his boyhood, youth, and early manhood. Hatred of the Infidel, and a determination to

avenge his father's blood, crying to him from a Moorish grave, were the earliest of his instincts. As a youth he was distinguished for his prowess. When sixteen years of age he took part in the battle of Fontarabia, and by his ability to endure hardship, by his brilliant and desperate courage, and by the example of military discipline which he afforded the troops, contributed in no small degree to the success of the Spanish arms.

In 1530 he accompanied the emperor in his campaign against the Turks. Charles V., recognizing his merits as a military officer, distinguished him with his favor at the opening of his career. Young, brave, and enthusiastic, Ferdinand de Toledo at this period was as interesting a hero as ever illustrated the pages of Castilian romance. His mad ride from Hungary to Spain and back again, accomplished in seventeen days, for the sake of a brief visit to his newly-married wife, is not the least attractive incident in the history of an existence which was destined to become so dark and sanguinary. It was characteristic of his wild courage and dauntless energy.

Selected for a military command by Charles V., he took part in the siege of Tunis (1535) and successfully defended Perpignan against the dauphin of France. In 1546 and 1547 he was generalissmo in the war against the Smalcaldian league. His most brilliant feat of arms was the passage of the Elbe and the battle of Mühlberg, accomplished in spite of Maximilian's bitter reproaches, and the tremendous possibilities of a defeat. That battle had finished the war. The magnanimous John Frederick, surprised at his devotions in the church, fled in dismay. The rout was total. "I came, I saw, and God conquered," said the emperor in pious parody of his immortal predecessor's epigram. So sudden and complete was the victory achieved by the young Ferdinand, that it was accounted for on the supposition of miraculous intervention.

He took part in the siege of Wittenberg, and at its capture presided at the court-martial which tried and condemned to

death the elector. Spared by his good fortune from being engaged in the Algerine expedition, or in witnessing the ignominious retreat from Innspruck, he was obliged to submit to the intercalation of the disastrous siege of Metz in the long history of his successes. He was then made commander-in-chief of the armies in Italy.

After the abdication of Charles, he was retained by Philip II., who, however, restrained him from committing the excesses to which his cruel disposition naturally prompted him. He had subdued the whole campagna, and was before the gates of Rome. Here he received orders from Philip to negotiate a peace. One of the conditions was that he should ask the forgiveness of the pontiff he had conquered. Accustomed as he was to almost imperial rule, haughty and unbending, this was a bitter task for the young duke. His voice failed him and he lost his presence of mind during the ceremony.

In 1554 he accompanied Philip to England on his matrimonial expedition. In 1559 he was sent to Paris to espouse, in the name of his master, Elizabeth, daughter of Henry, king of France.

But it is in connection with the revolt of the Netherlands that the Duke of Alva won his infamous laurels. His history is inextricably entangled with the fight for freedom which that country waged for eighty years. On its face he wrote with his sword his history in letters of fire and blood. Under Charles V. these provinces had been relentlessly crushed. The screws of extortion had been turned to the last thread. Protestantism had long been gaining ground in that country and for the suppression of this heresy Charles, as we have seen, had established the papal Inquisition, side by side with those terrible "placards," of his invention, which constituted a masked inquisition more cruel, if possible than that of Spain. Before his abdication in 1555 he bequeathed his magnificent empire to his son Philip II., who by his tyrannical rule rendered himself more odious to the liberty loving Netherlanders than his father. He fostered

with jealous care the Inquisition organized by Charles, and his principal solicitude after his accession to the throne was to maintain the Catholic faith throughout all his states. In things sacred he would admit no compromise. The Church alone, he said, had the right to prescribe rules to the faithful. He enforced, in the first month of his reign the inquisitorial decrees of his father, and thousands and tens of thousands of men, women, and children were tortured and burned and their "cinders" thrown away. This work going on year after year in every city of the Netherlands, and now set into renewed and vigorous action by a man who wore a crown only that he might the better torture his fellow-creatures, it was time that the very stones in the streets should be moved to mutiny. "For two whole years," says a Catholic citizen of Valenciennes at the time, "there was scarcely a week in which several citizens were not executed, and often a great number were dispatched at a time."

On the twenty-fourth of May, 1567, the regent of the Netherlands, Philip's sister, issued a fresh edict to revive in the memory of men the duty they owed to their Church and their God. By it all persons whose houses had been used for religious purposes by heretics were to be hanged; all parents or masters who had suffered their children or servants to attend said meetings were to be hanged, and the servants and children were to be beaten with rods; all people who sang hymns at the funerals of relatives and friends were to be hanged; parents who allowed their newly born infants to be baptized by other than Catholics were to be hanged, and the same punishment was given those who should christen the child or act as its sponsors. Those who infringed the statutes against the buying and selling of religious books and songs were to be hanged for the second offense. All sneers against ecclesiastics were capital crimes. Schoolmasters who should teach any error or false doctrine should be punished with death, and, finally, all Calvinistic ministers and teachers were to be hanged indiscriminately. In every case confiscation of the whole property of the criminal was added to the hanging.

This edict excited the wrath of Philip. It was too mild. The servants and children should have been burned instead of beaten; ministers and teachers quartered, instead of hung. Nothing, he said, could offend or distress him more deeply than any outrage offered to God and the Church. If we may judge by his words to show mercy to a heretic he considered violating the feelings of God, and to hang instead of burn a man who rejects the dogma of the infallibility of a man, is a most unpardonable insult to him whose mercy endureth forever.

And thus the ground was cleared for that superstructure of tyranny and inquisitorial cruelty which the Duke of Alva was so soon to rear. The future was indeed gloomy to the Netherlanders. The paths of peace which they loved so well to pursue were turned to walks of agony. Whichever way they turned they were met by the familiars of the Inquisition. The shadow of the gallows fell across every threshold; blackened stakes, with a handful of human ashes at the foot were all around them. Men could scarcely be executed fast enough to keep the dungeons clear. Hang and fang, burn and quarter, were the orders given from the Eternal City and echoed by the shrivelled monarch at the court of Spain; and while the country was paralyzed with its present and expected woe, quivering with its recollections of the past and shuddering at its thoughts of the future, the bugles of the Spanish army were heard to resound from beyond the Alps. The Duke of Alva was coming with 10,000 soldiers to convert the country to the Catholic faith.

At this time Alva was inferior to no general in Europe. As a disciplinarian he was foremost in Spain. A spendthrift of time, he was an economist of his soldier's lives, and this was, perhaps, in the eye of humanity, his only redeeming trait. "Time and myself are two," was a frequent observation of Philip, and his favorite general considered the words as applicable to war as to politics. Scheming, reckless, unprincipled, and brave, he could rush to victory in the lightning charge or wait in ambush for his foe for months. He never

wearied, was impervious to the criticisms of his officers, wasted no men unless sure of his point, and to gain that would sacrifice an army, and was in all respects the best, and at the same time the basest, tool an unprincipled monarch ever had to subjugate rebellious provinces. His most partial biographers admit his enormous avarice, his overbearing pride, his insatiable thirst for power. He had prodigious vices and no virtues. He was not lustful nor intemperate, because his whole energies were given to his trade of war. "The world has agreed that such an amount of stealth and ferocity, of patient vindictiveness, and universal bloodthirstiness were never found in a savage beast of the forest, and but rarely in a human bosom." Stealthy as a serpent, he exceeded the tiger in ferocity. Passionate to recklessness in his younger days, at this time the fires of youth were replaced by the calculating coolness of the scheming politician. Had he possessed the power, he would have ground the universe to dust, and laughed the while, to satisfy his ambition or serve his purpose. He was now nearly sixty years of age, and in person was tall, thin, erect, with a small head, a long visage, lean yellow cheek, dark twinkling eyes, adust complexion, black bristling hair, and a long, sable beard, silvered by time, descending in two waving streams upon his breast.

Such was the man selected by Philip to lead his armies into the Dutch provinces. With ten thousand picked men, who, says Brantôme, might have been mistaken for princes, with such agreeable and graceful arrogance did they carry themselves, and with a force of two thousand prostitutes as regularly enrolled, disciplined, and distributed as the cavalry or artillery, the duke embarked upon his momentous enterprise on the tenth of May, 1567, at Carthagena. Thirty-seven galleys, under command of Prince Andrea Doria, conveyed the principal part of the force to Genoa. On the second of June the army was mustered at Alexandria de Palla, and ordered to rendevouz again at San Ambrosia at the foot of the Alps. It was then directed to make its way over Mount Cenis, and through Savoy, Burgundy, and Lorraine, by a

regularly arranged triple movement. During the twenty-four days' march through Burgundy and Lorraine they were accompanied by a force of French and Swiss troops on either flank, who followed them like shadows till they were safe on the soil of the Netherlands.

The regent of the provinces was surprised at the action of Philip in placing Alva at the head of an army of invasion. "His name," she wrote to her brother, "is odious enough to make the whole Spanish nation detested in the Netherlands." Philip had, indeed, hesitated long before giving the command to Alva. He wanted his subjects conquered, but not exterminated. His, however, was the mercy of the slave-hunter, who debates with himself the propriety of unmuzzling his dogs before letting them loose upon a fleeing fugitive. If he muzzles them the victim might escape, while unmuzzled he will get only the bleeding body. Philip knew well the terrible temper of the man of wrath, and he had considered the consequence of removing the muzzle from his troops by placing Alva at their head. He had determined to hold his hereditary bondsmen, dead or alive.

Upon arriving in Holland, Alva proceeded in a methodical manner to his work. He distributed his troops through Brussels, Ghent, Antwerp, and other principal cities. As a measure of necessity, and to humiliate the municipalities, he required the magistrates to surrender the keys of the cities to his keeping. They remonstrated at the indignity put upon them, but unsuccessfully. Alva then proceeded to lay the traps to ensnare the leading noblemen of the country who had opposed the establishment of the Inquisition in the Dutch provinces. The Counts Horn, Egmont, Hoogstraaten, and especially the Prince of Orange, had by their efforts in behalf of the provinces, rendered themselves obnoxious to Philip, and he had determined upon their death. Alva had his instructions before leaving Madrid to destroy them, and he now proceeded to put his plan into operation.

On September 9, 1567, the grand prior, Ferdinand de Toledo, natural son of the Duke of Alva, gave a magnificent

dinner, to which Egmont and Horn, and many other gentlemen were invited. At three o'clock Alva sent a message, begging the gentlemen, after their dinner should be concluded, to favor him with their presence at his house to take part in his deliberation concerning the plan of a citadel which he contemplated erecting in Antwerp. Egmont and Horn, accompanied by the other gentlemen, proceeded to the house then occupied by Alva, to take part in the discussion proposed. They were received with great courtesy by the Duke, whose engineer soon appeared and laid upon the table a large parchment containing the plan of the citadel to be erected in Antwerp. A heated discussion soon arose upon the subject, which lasted until seven o'clock. When the council broke up, Egmont was requested to wait a moment. He tremblingly did so, and was told he was under arrest. He surrendered up his sword, saying, bitterly, that it had at least rendered some service to the king in times which were past. Count Horn was arrested on the same occasion, and both were confined in chambers, darkened and hung with black, in the mansion. They were soon after taken to the castle of Ghent, which they left only to ascend the scaffold.

This act of treachery and deceit illustrates well the character of the man commissioned by Philip to invade the Dutch provinces. His career in the Netherlands was marked by duplicity and cruelty. In his mad endeavor to subjugate the country, he lost all sense of honor and all feelings of shame. Some of the means taken by him to compass his ends were such as a professional police spy would have blushed to use, and were as despicable as his treatment of his captured enemies was inhuman. He measured the ability of a statesman by his capacity for lying and intriguing, declaring that a man who could not pervert the truth for the good of the State was unfit to hold a position of trust.

In order to facilitate the trying of persons for crimes committed during the recent disorders, Alva resolved to establish a new tribunal. It was called the Council of Troubles, but soon became known by the terrible name of the Blood Council.

It superseded all other courts, and even the Council of State fell into complete desuetude. In less than three months from the time of its inception, eighteen hundred persons had suffered death through its decrees. This council was the child of the fertile brain of Alva. To him alone belongs the infamous honor of its establishment, and had he done nothing else, it is sufficient to render his name execrable for all time. He was its parent, its fosterer, and its supreme judge. All the officers were of his appointing, himself being president, and his term of office was continuous. All its decisions were referred to him. It never possessed a shadow of legal right to its existence. No letters or grants from Philip were issued to it. Alva founded it by his military power and sustained it by the same means. On the fourth of January, 1567, this council condemned eighty-four inhabitants of Valenciennes: on another day ninety-five miscellaneous individuals from different places in Flanders; on another, forty-six inhabitants of Malines; on another, thirty-five persons from different localities, and so on. On the evening of Shrovetide, a favorite holiday in the Netherlands, five hundred persons were captured, condemned, and immediately executed. Some even were murdered before they were tried, and even dead men were beheaded that their estates might revert to the crown.

Thus the whole country became a charnel-house. The dismal tones of the death-bell were heard hourly in every village. Not a family but that mourned for some of their nearest and dearest friends and relatives. The once busy streets of the populous cities were deserted and fast being covered with green grass. The spirit of the nation was humbled—almost broken. The blood of its best and bravest had already stained the scaffold, and the survivors wandered listlessly through streets filled with the corpses of human beings. The ordinary means of execution were found to be altogether inadequate. Columns and stakes were planted in every street; even the door-posts of private houses were used: the fences in the fields were laden with human carcasses,

strangled, burned, beheaded. Bodies in all stages of decomposition were scattered through field and forest, and the staring eyes of death looked up from every ditch and gutter.

On the sixteenth day of February, 1568, a sentence of the Holy Office condemned all the inhabitants of the Netherlands to death as heretics. From this universal doom only a few persons, mentioned by name, were excepted. A proclamation of the king, dated ten days later, ordered the sentence to be carried into instant execution, without regard to sex, age, or condition. Three millions of people were condemned to death in three lines. Under this new decree, the executions did not slacken. Alva, in a letter to Philip, informed him that the number of executions which were to take place immediately after the expiration of Holy Week reached the number of eight hundred. To avoid the disturbances created in the streets by the frequent harangues of the victims on their way to the scaffold or the stake, a new gag was invented, which pleased Alva exceedingly. The tongue of each condemned person was screwed into an iron ring, and then seared with a hot iron. The swelling and inflamation which were the immediate results prevented the tongue from slipping through the ring, and the prisoner was speechless.

The Netherlanders were maddened, desperate. The submissiveness of the subject was gone. In its place was a bitter hatred of their persecutor, the Duke of Alva, and an unconquerable desire to throw off the yoke of oppression. Then commenced that terrible struggle for liberty which has gained for the Dutch their reputation for dogged courage and resistlessness of purpose before which everything must fall. Three millions of people fought the mightiest empire of their time—an empire of almost boundless wealth and military resources. Led by the Prince of Orange, the Washington of the Dutch republic, they waged a war unparalleled in the annals of the world. In this war the Duke of Alva had an opportunity, which he was not slow to seize, of displaying his peculiar talents for barbarity. There was never another general so base as he, never a soldier so cruel. Nero and

Caligula were humane beside him. To the horrors of war he added the torments of the Inquisition; the natural was supplemented by the supernatural; the cruelty of God augmented the barbarity of man. Rolling across skies red with the flames of innumerable martyr-fires, like an echoing roar to his cannon, came from the Vatican the mocking thunder, so ominous to the superstitious, of papal bulls, anathemas, excommunications, and edicts of death.

Alva went into the war with a pretended confidence in the prowess of the Spanish arms. He expressed his belief that four or five thousand choice troops would make a short war of it. One of his first commands to his generals was to hang and strangle all prisoners the moment they should be taken.

On the fifth of June the Counts Horn and Egmont were beheaded by order of Alva, and their heads placed high in a public place, there to remain until it should please the duke to otherwise order. This dastardly act only inflamed the passions of the people to a higher degree of hatred to Alva. His day of reckoning was yet to come.

The massacre of Jemmingen was among the first of Alva's victories. The patriot army, under Count Louis, had been defeated, and the Spaniards, by the order of Alva, threw themselves upon the flying troops. No resistance was made, none could be made, nor was any quarter given. The provincial army was butchered like sheep in a slaughter-pen. Seven Spaniards were slain, and seven thousand rebels. The sickening carnage was continued for hours, and it was not until two days had elapsed that it was considered complete. At the expiration of that time there were no more rebels within reach. The Spanish army then marched to Groningen. On their way they committed the foulest outrages and the deepest crimes. Maids and wives were violated; old men were butchered in cold blood. The burning of hamlets and farm-houses kept the sky lurid with the conflagration; everything was reduced to ashes. So terrible was the conduct of his soldiers that Alva was compelled to hang several of them to preserve the discipline of his army.

Several skirmishes and two more battles followed in rapid succession, in all of which the Duke was successful. They were marked by the same bloodthirstiness, the same spirit of carnage and rapine, as the battle of Jemmingen. Alva was in the zenith of his glory as a military commander, and he had vindicated his claim to be considered the first warrior of his age. By his lieutenants he had summarily and rapidly destroyed two of the armies sent against him; he had in person annihilated the third, and foiled the fourth, and this so successfully that without losing a man he had destroyed eight thousand of his enemies. Such achievements might well make even a meeker nature proud. On his return to Brussels he instituted a succession of triumphant festivals. The houses so lately covered with marks of mourning, were decked with garlands; the bells, used to tolling for his victims, now rang in his honor; the streets, but lately filled with the corpses of the slain, were covered with softest carpets for him to tread upon; the square in which the shadow of the gallows still lingered, resounded with gay tournaments and shouts of laughter, which must have sounded like hollow mockery in the ears of the revelers. But these honors were not enough. The Duke reared a colossal statue of himself, and upon its pedestal caused these words to be engraved: "To Ferdinand Alvarez de Toledo, Duke of Alva, Governor of the Netherlands under Philip the Second, for having extinguished sedition, chastised rebellion, restored religion, secured justice, established peace, to the king's most faithful minister, this monument is erected."

Self-worship never went farther than in this remarkable monument, erected in Alva's honor, by Alva's hands. It would have been gross flattery had the deeds recounted really been performed. But as he had neither extinguished sedition, restored religion, secured justice, nor established peace, it was a pompous lie, prompted by inordinate vanity and self-conceit. The statue was placed in the citadel at Antwerp. Its bronze was furnished by the cannon captured at Jemmingen. It remained to insult and madden the inhabitants of

the Netherlands until it was destroyed by Alva's successor, Requesens.

In the month of May, 1569, the Duke's agents burned a lay Anabaptist and four clergymen, the eldest past seventy years of age, for no crime save that they favored the Reformation. They were taken before a prelate, who, by clipping from their heads a lock of hair and scraping their crowns gently with a little silver knife, removed the holy oil of consecration, after which they were turned over to the Blood Council. They were mercifully strangled before being burned.

While the creatures of the Duke were thus zealously enforcing his decrees, and the Duke was strenuously exerting himself to crush the fast-spreading heresy of the country, a messenger arrived from the Pope, bringing to Alva as a present a jeweled hat and sword. It was a gift rarely conferred by the Church, and never save to the highest dignitaries, or those who had specially exerted themselves in her defense. The Duke was requested in an autograph letter from the Pope, "to remember when he put the hat upon his head, that he was guarded with it as with a helmet of righteousness, and with the shield of God's help, indicating the heavenly crown which was ready for all princes who support the holy Church and the Roman Catholic faith."

The funds in the Spanish treasury were getting low. Alva had boasted that a golden stream, a yard deep, would flow from the Netherlands into the coffers of Philip, but as yet his expectations were not realized. He now undertook to keep his word with his royal master. He imposed a tax of one per cent on all real and personal property in the country, to be collected immediately. A tax of five per cent was laid upon every transfer of real estate, and a tax of ten per cent was laid upon every article of merchandise, to be paid as often as it should be sold. The last two taxes were to be perpetual. Such enormous burdens were never before laid upon any people. If persisted in they would utterly destroy the commerce of the country, leaving nothing to be taxed. But the Duke

held obstinately to his purpose. To all representations of the impossibility of long collecting it, leaving out of sight the deep injustice of the measure, he turned a deaf ear. It was nothing more than the Spanish *alcabala*, he said, and he derived a yearly income of 50,000 ducats from its imposition in his own city of Alva. The scheme was obviously so impossible that it met with nothing but ridicule in Madrid, and the most bitter resistance in the provinces. Alva's reputation as a financier was doomed.

In 1571 Philip concocted a plot to assassinate Queen Elizabeth of England, and place on the throne the queen of Scotland. The plot failed through the loquacity of one of the principal agents, but Alva was not disheartened. In December, of the same year he sent two Italian assassins to England with instructions to take the life of Elizabeth, quietly, by poison or otherwise. These ruffians were not destined to succeed, but Alva renewed his attempts from time to time.

He had now been governor of the Netherlands nearly five years, and the abhorrence in which his name was held nearly amounted to frenzy. By his tyranny he had driven thousands of refugees out of the country, and through his cruelty thousands more out of the world. What had once been a prosperous nation was fast becoming a barren waste. The land was rapidly being depopulated, and those that remained were broken in spirit and bankrupt in purse. A withering blight had settled upon the whole country.

The Netherlanders had one friend who was indefatigable in his endeavors to expel the Spanish army from the country. The Prince of Orange never ceased his exertions in behalf of the prostrate people. He had sent his agents to every place where a hope was held out to him of obtaining support. His strength slowly but surely increased, until he had an army and navy able, though as yet but ineffectually, to cope with the Duke of Alva. The country was ravaged by the contending armies, and the ocean was covered with patriot vessels, which the Spaniards deridingly nick-named the "beggers

of the seas." Had not the treacherous monarch of France basely deserted the Prince, the Netherlands would have soon been free.

Alva besieged Mons, which, after a prolonged and desperate resistance, capitulated. The soldiers and citizens who had borne arms were guaranteed pardon and protection. The city was evacuated on the twenty-first of September; Alva entered it on the twenty-fourth. On the fifteenth of December the executions commenced. The citizens had been promised immunity for their deeds, but a promise made to a heretic by a Catholic is not necessarily kept. The intrepid De Leste, who had commanded a band of volunteers during the seige, was one of the first victims. In consideration of his being a gentleman he was executed by the sword. Many others followed in quick succession. Some were beheaded, some were hanged, some were burned alive. All who had borne arms were put to death. Such as refused to confess and receive the Catholic sacraments perished by fire. A poor wretch, for ridiculing these mysteries, had his tongue torn out before being beheaded. One man was hanged for having eaten meat soup on Friday. Many paupers were executed for having gone to Protestant preaching for the sake of participating in the distribution of alms. An old man of sixty-two was beheaded for having allowed his son to bear arms among the volunteers. When all other pretexts had failed, sentences of death were passed upon persons suspected of harboring in their hearts a feeling friendly to the Reformation. Ten, twelve, twenty, were often murdered by this tyrant in a day. The work of proscription, condemnation, and death, was carried on for months. Till the twenty-seventh of August of the following year (1573) the executioner never rested, and when Requesens, successor to Alva, opened the prisons of Mons he found seventy-five individuals condemned to the block and awaiting their fate.

In Mons the Spaniards possessed the key to the whole southern Netherlands. The neighboring cities now hastened to renew their allegiance to Alva. In general he

accepted the new oaths of fidelity but he determined to make an example of the beautiful city of Mechlin. The pay of the Spanish troops was in arrears. To indemnify them, he abandoned this town to the license of his soldiery. Three long days did the sack continue. The property of friend and foe, of Papist and Calvanist, was indiscriminately rifled. Church property was not spared, hospitals were sacked, public buildings were torn down; in short, hardly one stone upon another was left. The sack of Mechlin was one of the most complete and horrible in the annals of war, and for it the Duke was directly and solely responsible. He deliberately ordered it, and although he laid the blame upon the Almighty, saying it was a divine chastisement, and although there is nothing inconsistent in such wholesale slaughter and rapine with the record—as we have it in the Bible—of the God of the Christians, yet we must conclude that that figment of men's brains had very little to do with it.

Shortly after the committal by the Duke of this diabolical and cold-blooded wholesale murder and robbery, his armies met with several severe reverses. The rebel forces, directed by the loyal patriot, William the Silent, Prince of Orange, defeated Alva at the seige of Alkmaar, and three days after gained a signal victory over the Spanish naval forces. These successes, coming at the close of his administration, galled the self-conceited Duke, who was rather wont to consider himself, and the Spanish army invincible. But his brilliant exploits, by which he had struck terror into the heart of the Netherlanders, at Jemmingen and in Brabant, had been effaced by the valor and courage of a handful of undisciplined and inexperienced Hollanders. He was sunk lower in the estimation of all classes than he had ever been before during his long and generally successful life. He felt himself growing odious to everybody. The patriots hated him, and the Spaniards were fast coming to detest him. He was weary of staying in a country where nobody, not even his officers, respected him, and from which prince and people were united in their efforts to drive him.

His headquarters during his several campaigns had been at Amsterdam. Here he had contracted an enormous public and private debt. Accordingly, early in November he caused a proclamation to be issued throughout the city by sound of trumpet, that all persons having claims upon him were to present them, in person, upon a specified day. During the night preceding the day so appointed he and his train noiselessly took their departure for Brussels. By this skillful tactic his creditors were foiled as completely as his enemies had been on former occasions. The majority of these debts were never paid, and many opulent families were thereby reduced to beggary.

On the seventeenth of November, 1573, Don Luis de Requesens of Cuñiga, Grand Commander of St. Jago, the successor of Alva, arrived in Brussels, where he was received with great rejoicings. On the eighteenth of December, the Duke of Alva took his departure from the Netherlands forever. He had kept his bed for the greater part of the time during the last few weeks of his government of the provinces, partly on account of the gout, partly to avoid being seen in his humiliation, but mainly to escape the importunites of his swindled creditors. He expressed a fear of journeying homeward through France, for the reason that he might receive a shot from a window as he passed. He complained that, after all his labors, he had not "gained the approbation of the king," while he had incurred "the malevolence and universal hatred of every individual in the country." Mondoucet, to whom he made the observation, replied that the Duke "had engendered such an extraordinary hatred in the hearts of all persons in the land that they would have fireworks in honor of his departure if they dared."

On his journey from the Netherlands, he boasted that he had caused eighteen thousand six hundred executions during his government. These were all religious murders. "The number of those who had perished by battle, seige, starvation, and massacre defied computation."

For some time after his return to Madrid, the Duke was

treated with great distinction. But his son, Don Frederic, having deceived and abandoned a maid of honor and then espoused his cousin in order to avoid the reparation by marriage which his offense demanded, father and son were alike disgraced. Both were imprisoned in the castle of Uzeda. Don Antonio, however, having usurped the crown of Portugal, Philip needed an experienced general to lead his armies. He sent for Alva and gave him the command, but not forgiving him for his misdeed. In 1581 Alva defeated Antonio, driving him out of Portugal. Entering Lisbon, the Duke seized immense treasures and gave his soldiers license to sack the city and vicinity, which they did with a completeness only attainable by long service under a general skilled in the trade of war and rapine. Alva made no return to the royal treasury of his captured booty, and it is reported that upon being asked by an agent of Philip for an account of the gold and silver plundered from the city, he replied: "If the king asks me for an account, I will make him a statement of kingdoms preserved or conquered, of signal victories, of successful seiges, and of sixty years' service." Philip deemed it inexpedient to press his inquiries further.

In 1582, after having accomplished the mission intrusted to him in Portugal, he fell into a lingering fever, at the close of which he was so pitiably reduced that he was only kept alive by milk, which he drank from a woman's breast. His life went out with the expiring year.

Whatever may have been his merits as a soldier, or his capacity as a general—and they were undoubtedly great—his name, his fame, and his honor must forever rest under the black shadow of his heartless career in the Netherlands. No slurring of facts or glossing of crimes by partial historians; no eulogies or encomiums by Christians; no christening saint by pope, or dubbing knight by king can render his life and record other than that of an unfeeling tyrant actuated by pride, avarice, ambition, and a cruel disregard of the sacred right of civil and religious freedom.

JOHN KNOX.

This work would be imperfect without a sketch of the noted, persistent, and implacable Scotch reformer. He was a man who possessed sterling qualities, but whose religion made him a bigot and a hard-hearted, relentless despot. The good qualities he possessed, unfortunately, were overbalanced by his intolerance, bitterness, and brutality.

John Knox was born in 1505, of humble parents. He was educated for the priesthood at Haddington and St. Andrews, and appears to have been a close student. The Reformation had made considerable headway in Scotland before he came upon the stage; but it was not until after he enlisted in it and became its prime mover that it went forward to a successful triumph.

In 1549, or 1550, in spite of the vows of celibacy he had taken in the Romish Church, he was married to Miss Marjory Bowes, which was doubtless a very sensible movement on his part.

One of the blackest charges under which the memory of Knox rests is his participation in the assassination of Cardinal Beatoun in 1546. The clear description of the affair, from Archbishop Spalding's "History of the Protestant Reformation," vol. ii, p. 231, will be given:

"This barbarous assassination was concocted two years before, in England by the brutal Henry VIII., who was enraged with the cardinal for having foiled him in his attempt to get possession of the person of Mary Stuart, the infant queen of the Scots. The famous reformed Scottish priest and martyr, George Wishart—the religious teacher of Knox—came to England the bearer of a proposition from

certain Scottish lords, 'to apprehend and slay the cardinal.' Henry would not directly commit himself, but probably answered, as he did a year later to a similar proposal, that the parties had better do the deed and trust to his gratitude for the reward. The deed was done on the twenty-ninth of May, 1546, by assassins who, according to Foxe, 'were stirred up by the Lord.' The government of Edward VI. approved of it, and entered into a regular treaty with the assassins. Two months previously, Wishart, who had been the bearer of the infamous message to Henry, and who had stirred up riots and seditions wherever he preached, had unfortunately fallen into the hands of the cardinal and had been first hanged for sedition and then burned for heresy."

"What part did Knox and the reformers take in this treacherous and bloody deed, with which the Scottish Reformation was inaugurated? The answer is easily given. They openly approved of it, if they were not even accessory to it before the fact. Knox, to mark his approbation of 'the godly deed,' immediately threw one hundred and forty of his followers into the castle of St. Andrews to aid the assassins; and they all resolved together to resist the Scottish authorities to the last extremity, and to throw themselves on the protection of England.

"Knox not only defended the 'godly deed,' but he spoke of it in a tone of levity and even of mockery, which betokened great hardness of heart, to use the softest expression. His biographer, indeed, endeavors to excuse him for this, on the ground that he was not able to restrain 'his vein of humor; though he admits that 'the pleasantry which Knox mingles with his narrative of his (Beatoun's) death and burial is unreasonable and unbecoming.' Knox evidently thought that this assassination—as some of his friends said afterwards of his own famous sermon, to prove that the pope was Antichrist—was going at once to the very root of the matter."

Knox partially espoused the cause of the Reformation as early as 1535, but did not openly profess Protestantism until

1542. A year after the assassination of Cardinal Beatoun, he was taken prisoner by the French, who stormed the castle of St. Andrews, and was carried into France where he was detained two years. He returned to Scotland, but not coveting the crown of martyrdom, he fled to England, where he remained several years, employed as a missionary and chaplain of Edward VI. In 1554, apprehending danger, after the ascension of Mary he fled to Geneva where he several times betook himself in times of peril. Under the protection of Calvin he felt secure. There was a filiation of views and sentiments there that he scarcely found anywhere else. He frequently wrote to his disciples in Scotland during the three years he was away from them, and returned to them in 1559 when everything had ripened there for the establishment of a new Kirk. The change from the Catholic to the Protestant religion was probably more speedy and more thorough in Scotland than in any other country. In consummating this change, violence, treachery, and spoilation were the agencies freely employed. Let the archbishop speak again:

"That the Scottish nobles who joined the Reformation were impelled to do so by the hope of plunder, and that they were instigated and aided to achieve their ends by the English government there can be little doubt. Some of them, as we have already seen, had been intruded into the richest and most influential benefices of the Church; others hoped to build up their fortunes in a similar way. The former joined the reformers in order to secure to themselves and their posterity their ill-gotten goods, the latter with the well-grounded hope to better their condition in the new order of things which was to arise on the ruins of the old." McCrie, the Protestant writer, says: "It has often been alleged that the desire of sharing in the rich spoils of the popish church, together with the intrigues of the court of England, engaged the Scottish nobles on the side of the Reformation. It is reasonable to think that, at a later period, this was so far true."

As an indication of the spirit which prevailed in the country and governed the fiery Knox and his associates, Mc-

Crie describes an instance where Knox preached a sermon at Perth, in May, 1559, in which he denounced the idolatry of the mass and of image worship. At the close of the sermon, and while several persons loitered in the church, an over-zealous priest, wishing either to try the disposition of the people or to show his contempt for the doctrines that had been preached, uncovered a rich altar-piece decorated with images and prepared to celebrate mass. A boy having uttered some expressions of disapprobation was struck by a priest. The boy retaliated by throwing a stone at the aggressor, which falling on the altar broke one of the images. This served as a signal to arouse the passions of the people present who immediately took part with the boy, and in the course of a few minutes the altar, images, and all the ornaments of the Church were torn down and trampled under foot. The noise soon collected a mob, who finding little to do in the church turned at once upon the monasteries and tore them to the ground. The authorities were unable to stay their ferocity (McCrie p. 182). These exhibitions became to be not at all uncommon; the burning of monasteries and Church property was by no means unusual. The archbishop says: "With the gospel in one hand and the fire-brand in the other, Knox and his brother preachers marched through Scotland, everywhere establishing the Reformation in the light of burning churches and monasteries, with the noble monuments of art and learning which they contained." Knox, in the sermons which he was constantly giving the people, advocated the pulling down of the monasteries and destroying the images, pictures, and libraries so much revered and prized by devotees.

McCrie, the biographer of Knox, defends the vandalism in this language: "Scarcely anything in the progress of the Scottish Reformation has been more frequently or more loudly condemned than the demolition of those edifices upon which superstition had lavished all the ornaments of the chisel and pencil. To the Roman Catholics, who anathamatized all who were engaged in this work of inexpiable sacrilege, and represented it as involving the overthrow of all

religion, have succeeded another race of writers (Protestant), who, although they do not, in general, make high pretensions to devotion, have not scrupled at times to borrow the language of their predecessors, and have bewailed the wreck of so many precious monuments in as bitter strains as ever idolator did the loss of his gods. These are the warm admirers of Gothic architecture and other reliques of ancient art; some of whom, if we may judge from their language, would welcome back the reign of superstition, with all its ignorance and bigotry, if they could recover the objects of their adoration" (p. 193).

Among the intolerant acts passed by the Knox or reforming party in Scotland, and which showed that their object was not religious freedom so much as religious domination and ascendency, the following as given in Lingard's history of England, (vol. vii, p. 294–5) sufficiently exemplifies:

"1. An act was passed to abolish the papal jurisdiction in Scotland, and to provide punishment for any man who should presume to act under it.

"2. The administration of baptism after the Catholic rite and the celebration of mass in public or in private were prohibited under the penalty, both to the minister who should officiate, and to the persons who should be present, of forfeiture for the first offense, of banishment for the second, and of death for the third.

"3. A confession of faith framed by Knox and his associates, after the Geneva model, was approved, and every existing law incompatible with the profession of it was repealed.

"4. Every member of the convention who refused to subscribe to the new creed *was instantly expelled;* an ingenious device to refuse justice to those Catholics who, under the late pacification, claimed compensation for their losses during the war. After the exclusion, the names of the complainants were twice called; neither they nor their attorneys were present to support their claims; and it was declared that 'the lordis and nobilitie had don thair duetie conform to the articles of the peax (peace).'

"5. The earls of Morton and Glencairn with Secretary Lethington, were commissioned to wait on the English queen and to propose to her, in the name of the estates, a marriage with the earl of Arran, son to the presumptive heir to the Scottish crown."

This was the act of parliament in 1560, at the opening of which Knox preached to them and urged them to decisive action.

The archbishop gives several instances of Knox's implacable hatred to Mary, Queen of Scots, on her reception in Scotland, one of which is as follows: "When poor Mary sent for Knox, after he had coarsely attacked from the pulpit her contemplated marriage with Darnley, he was unmoved by her tears, and he relentlessly mocked at her acute sufferings. If not directly privy to the brutal assassination of her faithful secretary, Rizzio, perpetrated in her own chamber and before her very eyes, and when she was near her confinement, Knox openly expressed his satisfaction at the horrid deed of blood, describing it as 'an event which contributed to the safety of religion and the commonwealth, if not also his approbation of the conduct of the conspirators.' So implacable in his hatred was this newly-modeled saint, that he persistently refused 'to pray for her welfare and conversion, representing her as a reprobate whose repentance was hopeless, and uttering imprecations against her.' Such was the charge formally made against him in the General Assembly of the kirk, which met in March, 1571, and his accuser promised to sustain it at the next assembly, 'if the accused continued his offensive speeches and was then "law-byding and not fugitive according to his accustomed manner."' Knox repelled with scorn the last imputation—which his whole life had nevertheless proved true—but he still persisted in his determination not to pray for the queen" (vol. ii, p. 247).

Of Knox as an intriguer and conspirator, the archbishop speaks thus: "But towering above all these secretly plotting or boldly acting bad men stands forth John Knox, alternately their agent and their tool, but never their dupe; instigating

them to almost every deed of treachery and blood; aiding them to carry out their wicked designs, by stirring up the lowest passions of the populace through his rugged but overpowering eloquence in the pulpit; and encouraging them with his secret applause or open eulogy whenever they had succeeded in accomplishing their bloody work! Thus, as we have seen, he approved, even if he did not instigate, the assassination of Beatoun and poor Rizzio, while he certainly was the prime mover in all the atrocious acts of cruelty towards the unhappy Mary herself. Sometimes, indeed, he rebuked the religious indifference, or lashed the vices of the lords of the congregation, especially when the latter did not choose to be restrained by the rigid formalities and outward observances exacted by the newly established discipline of the Kirk; but if they attended the kirk regularly and observed the rules of decorum in their public walk; if they were fiery in their zeal for the new religion, they were held up by him for imitation as saints, though their hearts were full of malice, their tongues of treachery, and their hands of blood. In the eyes of Knox, hatred of the pope, like the mantle of charity, 'covered a multitude of sins;' and if a man proved himself a good hater, he had already gone far towards attaining to his standard of Christian perfection" (vol. ii, p. 251).

The archbishop gives strong proof of Knox committing forgery in getting up a letter which he pretended came from France, of which Randall, who knew Knox well, in speaking of the letter, said: "I geese to savor to muche of Knox stile to come from Fraunce, though it will serve to good purpose." He also gives abundant instances of the malignant intolerance and hard-heartedness of Knox and his associates, and in doing this makes free quotations of Protestant writers and biographers. In speaking of Knox's interview with the unhappy Mary, he gives this language: "Notwithstanding the coarse rudeness of Knox, the queen still sought to win him by kindness, and in order to prevent his fiercely inveighing against her in public, she condescended to beg him to

become her monitor in private, whenever he might have anything to find fault with in her conduct.

"When the queen received advantageous offers of marriage from various Catholic courts of Europe, Knox and his co-religionists took the alarm, apprehending danger to the ascendency of the Kirk, or rather fearing that such an alliance might deprive them of the luxury of persecuting all who ventured to dissent from the new Church establishment. Knox on this occasion employed all his eloquence to induce the lords of the congregation to take effectual steps to prevent any such matrimonial alliance." He mocked at her tears and exhibited persistent intolerance and relentlessness. "Knox was more than once taken to task in the Assembly of the Kirk for his virulent abuse of the queen from the pulpit. In such cases he took little pains to soften, much less to retract his harsh language of denunciation. . . . On the queen's marriage with Darnley, instead of popular acclamations, a tumult ensued, which lasted the whole night. This was evidently caused by the virulent invectives of Knox against her marriage with a Catholic prince, as Darnley professed to be, though in his case there appears to have been little of religion beyond the mere profession. The morning after this popular commotion she felt compelled to convene the burgesses and magistrates of the city, and she addressed them in a strain of eloquence which appears for the time at least, to have soothed even their fierce intolerance. . . . . Darnley had a much easier and a much more pliant conscience than his noble consort. To conciliate Knox and the Kirkers, he went to the kirk-preaching the Sunday following the marriage, and he there heard—what he richly deserved to hear—a fierce and coarse personal invective against himself from the implacable reformers. The incident is somewhat amusing, while it is eminently characteristic of Knox:

"As we have already shown, the chief enemy of Mary, and the arch-intriguer against her peace in Scotland, was her own 'dear cousin,' Elizabeth of England. The 'virgin queen' pursued her with a malignity which, if we had not positive

evidence to prove its *human* source, we should be inclined to ascribe to satanical origin. Among numerous instances of this atrocious plotting, we present the following, and if the plot herein referred to, and triumphantly proved by Miss Strickland, can be paralleled for cold-blooded treachery and baseness in all previous history, we are not aware of the fact. It will be seen that the infamous plot was hatched not long after the northern insurrection, while poor Mary was a close prisoner in England, and that the State paper on which the evidence of it rests is in Cecil's own handwriting." The archbishop then makes the following quotation from Miss Strickland's "Queens of England," thus:

"The Scotch had sold her (Elizabeth's) fugitive rebel, the earl of Northumberland, into her hands, that she might execute her vengeance upon him; and Elizabeth, in return, proposed not to sell but to resign their injured sovereign into the cruel hands of Morton and the regent Marr, to be dealt with in *the way of justice*—words, which were tantamount to Cromwell's private memorandum, 'to send such and such persons to London to be tried and executed.' There was, indeed, to be the mockery of a trial; but then the children or near kinsfolk of Morton and Marr were to be put into the hands of the English queen, as hostages, that, trial or not, the execution of Mary was to take place within four hours after she was given up to their tender mercies.

"The details of this iniquitous pact are clearly and succinctly related by Mr. Tytler, and the actual documents may be seen in the State Paper office. The instructions for Killigrew, to whom the arrangement of '*the great matter*,' as it was significantly termed by the diplomatic accomplices, was committed, are in Burleigh's own hand. The monuments of history afford not a more disgraceful document; nor has the light of truth ever unveiled a blacker mass of evidence than the correspondence between Killigrew, Burleigh, and Leicester, during the negotiation. Mary had, however, ceased to be an object of alarm to the rebel lords; and even her deadly foe, Morton, the wily accomplice in Darnley's murder, would

not undertake the office of the queen of England's hangman without a fee. Why should he and the regent Marr sell their souls for nought? They demanded money of the parsimonious Elizabeth, a yearly stipend withal, no less than the amount of the sum it cost her majesty for the safe keeping of her royal prisoner. The dark treaty was negotiated in the sick-chamber of the guilty Morton, with the ardent approbation of the dying Knox; and, after nearly six weeks' demur, the regent Marr gave consent, but was immediately stricken with a mortal illness, and died at the end of twenty-four hours. Morton insisted on higher terms, and, more than that, an advantageous treaty and the present of three thousand English troops, under the command of the earls of Huntington, Essex, and Bedford, to assist at the execution, otherwise he would not undertake it" (vol. vi, p. 283).

The archbishop continues: "Finally, the poor victim of persecution and tyranny, after lingering for nineteen years in an English prison, to which she was driven by the relentless persecution and unmanly intrigues of John Knox and his religious colleagues in Scotland, was put to death in a manner so very barbarous that the recital excites a shudder of horror in every generous heart, even after the lapse of three centuries." The particulars of this foul and bloody deed are pretty fully given in the sketch of Queen Elizabeth, and it is unnecessary to enter into them here. The fact that Knox took an active part in the intrigues that imprisoned and finally basely executed Mary, Queen of Scots, has been made apparent.

Knox died in 1572, at the age of sixty-seven years. He was a man of ability, but the religion which he had imbibed from John Calvin made him a relentless, unfeeling bigot. He had in his hands the power to do his countrymen a great amount of good: he did do them good service, perhaps, as it was; but had he been more governed by a true love of humanity, instead of preaching so strenuously the great value of faith in the efficacy of the blood of a dead God: had his views been broader and nobler, he could have done a far, far greater service to his countrymen and to the world.

THOMAS MUNZER.

THIS somewhat celebrated German fanatic and bigot was born at Stolberg in the Hartz Mountains in the year 1491. There is a tradition that his father was illegally executed by a count, and if this is true it may account somewhat for the direction the mind of the son afterwards took. He studied at Wittenberg where he received the degree of master. He afterwards became teacher at Aschersleben, and preached for several years in different places everywhere displaying a violent enmity to papacy. Luther's doctrines began about this time to spread rapidly and widely over Germany, and men's minds were actively aroused to shake off the effects of a religion that had become so irksome, and in their impetuous zeal they ran into as great excesses and committed wrongs as aggravated as those they claimed to oppose. Whilst Luther was shut up on the Wartberg and Carlstadt was committing the greatest violence in Wittenberg, the sect of Anabaptists was formed at Zwickau by Nicholaus Storch, a clothier, with whom Marx Stübner, Martin Kellner and Munzer associated themselves. They entered Wittenberg with their followers, but Luther attacked them with such force that both Storch and Carlstadt were compelled to leave the city.

Munzer promulgated his doctrines with more success at Altstedt in Thuringia where he preached from 1523. He assailed both the papacy and Luther with great violence, and excited the people, too, against the authorities, particularly after they were forbidden to attend his preaching. He easily persuaded them that God would soon deliver Christendom from the yoke under which it groaned. His followers increased so rapidly that Frederick, elector of Saxony, and

John, duke of Weimar, summoned him to Weimar to answer for his conduct, in 1524. Nothing further was done, however, than to direct the authorities to remove so dangerous a person from the city. Munzer disappeared and was not heard from again for a year, when he made his appearance at Nuremberg, visiting afterwards Schaffhausen and Mühlhausen. In the latter place he gained an entire ascendency over the populace, deposed the city council which forbade his preaching and appointed a new one, permitted the pillage of the monasteries and of the houses of the rich, and proclaimed a community of goods. Another fanatic, Pfeifer Eichsfeld, with a troop of plundering followers, joined Munzer. This event, and the information that forty thousand had assembled in Franconia and plundered and burned one hundred and fifty castles of the nobles and twenty-three monasteries, inflamed his zeal. He roused his adherents in the adjoining country, and prepared for war, promising his followers that he would raise them all to the rank of nobility.

Leaving Pfeifer governor of Mühlhausen, he proceeded with three hundred chosen men to Frankenhausen, broke off negotiations and aroused the ardor of the populace and succeeded in exciting them almost to a state of religious frenzy. Forces were raised and sent out by John of Saxony, Philip, landgrave of Hesse, and Henry, duke of Brunswick, against the religious fanatics, who amounted to eight thousand men, and who had done all they could to spread anarchy and carnage over the country through which they ravaged. It is claimed by some authorities that Munzer, with his band of religious outlaws, caused the death of forty thousand men, women, and children, but it is quite possible this number is an exaggeration. The forces which opposed Munzer attempted the peaceable submission of the zealots, but Munzer would not listen to it, and in the engagement which followed he was totally defeated after an obstinate struggle, May 15, 1525. The insurgents lost seven thousand killed, and many of the survivors threw themselves into the Frankenhausen. Munzer concealed himself in bed, feigning sickness, but was discov-

ered, and when placed upon the rack he confessed his accomplices. Pfeifer, in attempting an escape from Mühlhausen, was made prisoner. Both, with twenty-four others, were condemned, and were executed at Mühlhausen. Munzer acted in a pusillanimous and dastardly manner. After he was beheaded his body was impaled and his head stuck upon a stake. Thus was probably fortunately terminated the career of an implacable zealot, who, in the name of the religion of Jesus, readily put thousands of his fellow-beings to an untimely death, and would gladly have continued the work of carnage had life and opportunities been spared him.

He was a fair exemplication of the extent to which a religious fanaticism will carry one who allows it to lead him, instead of the more safe guides, reason and common sense. Munzer, by nature, was not a bad man, and, under proper influences, and freed from the effects of bigotry and religious zeal, he might have done good in the world, been an honor to himself, and a benefit to his countrymen. As it was, however, giving his entire attention to persecuting and killing those whom he deemed the enemies of his God and of his faith, he was a scourge and a curse to the land where he dwelt. Happy was it for those around him that his career was a short one. Had he been favored with opportunity and power, he had the metal in him to constitute him a wholesale bloody, red-handed murderer and assassin "for Christ's sake."

MARY OF ENGLAND.

THERE was never such cruel times in England as during the reign of this wretched woman. She has become infamous in history as "Bloody Mary;" and as "Bloody Mary" her memory will ever be held in horror and detestation. She was the daughter of Henry VIII. by his first wife, Catherine of Aragon. She was born at Greenwich palace in 1516. She inherited her mother's gloomy temper, as well as her religion. Educated in the Catholic faith, she hated the reformed religion as connected with her mother's wrongs and sorrows. She steadfastly refused to read any religious books but such as were approved by her Church, and during the reign of the young Protestant king, Edward VI., she was the only person in the kingdom for whom the old mass was allowed to be performed. During the proceedings for divorce, Mary espoused the cause of her mother, and thereby became estranged from her royal father.

After the death of Anne Boleyn in 1539, Mary was induced to acknowledge the king as head of the reformed Church of England. She yielded an outward conformity to the successive changes of religion during her father's reign, thereby securing to herself the succession (after her brother) by act of parliament passed in 1514. During the reign of Edward VI., her half-brother, Mary steadfastly refused to conform to the Protestant religion. This led to an attempt to transfer the succession to her cousin, Lady Jane Grey.

The young king, Edward VI., looked upon the Catholic religion with the utmost horror. So, after he had fallen into a sickly condition and was near his end, he became exceedingly troubled to think that if Mary, the next heir to the throne,

succeeded, the hated religion would be set up again. Accordingly he was easily persuaded to set her aside and appoint his successor. Just before his death he deposited a writing with the crown lawyers, signed half a dozen times by himself, by which the succession to the crown was conferred upon Lady Jane Grey.

Edward died on the sixth of July, 1553. At this time the Lady Jane was a pretty girl of sixteen, amiable, learned, and clever. She was living at Sion House, near Brentford. According to the custom, a delegation of lords came and took her down the river in state to the Tower, that she might remain there until she was crowned. A powerful party among the nobility declared on Mary's side, and had her proclaimed queen at Norwich. At length Mary's right to the crown was generally recognized; and after a ten days' dream of royalty, Lady Jane Grey resigned her claim with great willingness, and gladly went back to her books in her pleasant home by the river.

Mary hastened on to London, and was crowned queen. She was then thirty-seven years of age, short and thin, wrinkled in the face, and in very poor health. And now the Catholic religion was again in the ascendant. A parliament was got together, before which the old mass was said in Latin. All the laws which favored the reformed religion were unmade. The old religion was to be put up and the new religion put down. This parliament declared Lady Jane guilty of treason for aspiring to the crown, Lord Guilford Dudley, her husband, guilty of treason for being her husband, and Cranmer for not believing in the mass. Dudley was executed on Tower Hill. From her prison window Lady Jane saw the bleeding and headless body of her husband brought back from the scaffold in a cart. Lady Jane was too young, innocent, and fair to be murdered before the people on Tower Hill; so she was executed within the Tower itself. She ascended the scaffold with a firm step and a quiet face. Addressing the by-standers in a steady voice, she said that she had been led to commit an unlawful act in taking what

was Mary's right, but that she had done so with no bad intent. She begged the executioner to dispatch her quickly, and inquired of him, "Will you take my head off before I lay me down?" He answered, "No, madam," and then she was very quiet while they bandaged her eyes. Being blinded and unable to see the block on which she was to lay her young head, she was seen to feel about for it with her hands, and was heard to say, confusedly: "Oh, what shall I do? Where is it?" Then they guided her to the right place, and her head was struck off. Of all the dreadful blows ever struck by the hateful axe in England, this was the most vile and cruel.

The execution of Lady Jane's father soon followed. Mary's next object was to get hold of the princess Elizabeth, her half-sister. Five hundred men were sent to arrest her at her retired residence at Ashbridge. The orders were to bring her to London, dead or alive. They took her from a sick-bed, put her in a litter, and brought her up to London. She was so weak and ill that she was five days on the road. She wrote to her sister, protesting her innocence of any offense; but instead of receiving any reply, she was taken in through the Traitor's gate, and confined in the Tower. Gardiner, the cruel and sullen bishop of Winchester, had designed her death. But the arrival, at this time, of prince Philip of Spain, changed Elizabeth's fortunes. A marriage had been negotiated between this proud, gloomy, and overbearing Spaniard and Mary. Some motive, probably other than manhood or honor, prompted Philip to oppose any violence being offered the princess. Elizabeth was released, and Hatfield House was assigned her as a residence.

The pope's messenger, Cardinal Pole, now arrived in England. The parliament presented a petition expressive of their great sorrow at the change in the national religion, and praying him to receive it again into the popish Church. This petition was read by Gardiner in the presence of parliament, with the queen sitting on her throne, the king on one side of her and the cardinal on the other. Everything was forgotten

and forgiven, and the country was once more solemnly made Roman Catholic.

A high court was opened for the trial of heretics. The queen declared to the council that she would wish none of her subjects to be burnt without some of the members being present, and that she would particularly wish good sermons at the burnings. And now the terrible bonfires were set alight. John Rogers, a prebendary of St. Paul, was brought to trial and found guilty. Soon afterwards he was taken out of jail to be burnt at Smithfield; and in the crowd, as he went along, he saw his poor wife and ten children. He was one of the first victims of Mary's terrible bonfires.

Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, was brought to trial for being married, though a priest, and for not believing in the mass. He admitted the accusations, and was sentenced to be burnt alive at Gloucester. The next day he was taken out for his last journey. A hood was put over his eyes so that he might not be known by the people. He was taken to a lodging, where he slept soundly all night. At nine o'clock next morning, he was brought forth leaning on a staff, for he had taken cold in prison and was infirm. The iron stake and the iron chain which was to bind him to it were fixed up near a great elm tree, in a pleasant open place before the cathedral, where, on peaceful Sundays, he had been accustomed to preach and to pray when he was bishop of Gloucester. This tree, which had no leaves then, it being February, was filled with people, and the priests of Gloucester College were looking complacently on from a window; and there was a great concourse of spectators in every spot from which a glimpse of the dreadful sight could be had. When the old man kneeled down on the small platform at the foot of the stake and prayed aloud, the nearest people were discovered to be so attentive to his prayers that they were ordered to stand further back; for it did not suit the Romish Church to have those Protestant words heard. His prayers concluded, he went up to the stake, and was stripped to his shirt, and chained ready for the fire. Then they heaped up wood, and straw,

and reeds, and set them on fire. But unhappily the wood was green and damp, and there was a wind blowing that blew what flame there was away. Thus, through three-quarters of an hour, the good old man was scorched and roasted and smoked, as the fire rose and sank; and all that time they saw him, as he burned, moving his lips in prayer, and beating his breast with one hand, even after the other was burnt away and had fallen off.

Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were taken to Oxford to dispute with a commission of priests and doctors about the mass. They were shamefully treated; and it is recorded that the Oxford scholars hissed and howled and groaned. The prisoners were taken back to jail, and afterwards tried in St. Mary's church. They were all found guilty. On the sixteenth of October, 1555, Ridley and Latimer were brought out to make another of the dreadful bonfires. The scene of the suffering of these two good Protestant men was in the city ditch, near Baliol College. On coming to the dreadful spot, they kissed the stakes, and then embraced each other. And then a learned doctor got up into a pulpit which was placed there, and preached a sermon from the text, "Though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." Ridley would have answered his sermon when it came to an end, but was not allowed. When Latimer was stripped, it appeared that he had dressed himself, under his other clothes, in a new shroud; and, as he stood in it before all the people, it was noted of him, and long remembered, that, whereas he had been stooping and feeble but a few minutes before, he now stood upright and handsome, in the knowledge that he was dying for a just cause. Then they were both chained up, and a light was thrown upon the pile to light it. "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley," said Latimer at that awful moment, "and play the man! We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out." And then he was seen to make motions with his hands as if he were washing them in the flames, and to stroke his aged face with them, and was heard

to cry, "Father of heaven! receive my soul." He died quickly; but the fire, after having burned the legs of Ridley, sunk. There he lingered, chained to the iron post, and crying, "O, I cannot burn! O, for Christ's sake, let the fire come unto me!" And still, when his brother-in-law had heaped on more wood, he was heard through the blinding smoke, still dismally crying, "O, I cannot burn, I cannot burn!" At last death ended his miseries.

Cranmer still remained in prison. He was brought out for another examination before the bloody Bonner, bishop of London, who had succeeded Gardiner in his horrid work. Mary hated Cranmer more than any other man on earth, and she had resolved to bring him to disgrace and death. As he was known to be a firm man, a plan was laid for surrounding him with artful people, and inducing him to recant his religious opinions. Deans and friars visited him, played at bowls with him, showed him various attentions, talked persuasively with him, gave him money for his prison comforts, and induced him to sign as many as six recantations. But after all, he was taken out to be burnt. After prayers and a sermon, a Dr. Cole, who had been one of the artful priests about him in prison, required him to make a public confession before the people. Cole did this, expecting that he would declare himself a Catholic. "I *will* make a profession of my faith," said Cranmer, "and with a good will too." Then he arose before them all, and took from the sleeve of his robe a written prayer, and read it aloud. That done, he knelt and said the Lord's Prayer; and then he arose again, and told them that he believed in the Bible, and that in what he had lately written, he had written what was not the truth; and that because his right hand had signed those papers, he would burn his right hand first when he came to the fire. As for the pope, he did refuse him and denounce him as the enemy of heaven. Hereupon the pious Dr. Cole cried out to the guards to stop that heretic's mouth and take him away. He was taken away and chained to the stake, where he took off his clothes to make ready for the flames. True to his word, Cramer, when

the fire was lighted, held out his right hand, and crying out, "This hand hath offended!" held it among the flames until it blazed and burned away. His heart was found entire among his ashes. He redeemed his reputation by his heroic death, and left a memorable name in the history of England.

At this time Philip, Mary's husband, was at war with France. He came over from Spain to seek the assistance of England. Since his marriage with Mary he had lived most of the time in his own dominions. It is said that he seldom referred to his royal wife, and then only to his most familiar courtiers, and generally in the way of some coarse jest. But the queen caused war to be declared in his behalf, and raised a large sum of money to carry it on. But the English were surprised at Calais by the French duke of Guise, and completely defeated. This great loss not only mortified the pride of the nation, but proved a blow from which the queen never recovered. Happily for her subjects, she took a fever which was raging in England at this time, and which, together with the news of the loss of Calais, brought the reign and life of the bloody monster to an end. She died on the seventeenth of November, 1558, after reigning not quite five years and a half, and in the forty-fourth year of her age. "When I am dead, and my body is opened," she said to those around her, "ye shall find Calais written on my heart." But had it been found that this woman had a heart, they would have more likely found written upon it, instead of Calais, these words: "*Lady Jane Grey, Hooper, Rogers, Ridley, Latimer, Cranmer, and three hundred people burnt alive within four years of my wicked reign, including sixty women and forty little children.*"

The news of her death gave great rejoicing all over the land. The rack and the stake had been the fruits of her barbarous reign, and the smoke of the fires that roasted men and women and little children to death had wrapped the nation in the gloom of a fearful horror. No name in the history of Great Britain is held in the remembrance of mankind with such utter detestation and abhorrence as that of Bloody Queen Mary.

CATHERINE DE MEDICI.

No one can reflect without a shudder of horror upon the career of this wretched woman, who, for a time, held in her unsteady hand the destiny of fair and progressive France. By most of Roman Catholic writers this French Medea is adorned with all saintly virtues as the guardian and defender of the faith. To the historian she is an incomprehensible mystery. If ever a woman was guided by a malignant star, it was Catherine de Medici. Only an impartial statement of some of her cruelties and crimes will be attempted in this short sketch. The wife of one French king, the mother of three, the leader of the revelries and politics of the age in which she lived, the career of this female fiend, whose malevolent touch checked for a time the civilization of France, is one of more than ordinary interest.

Catherine was born at Florence in 1519, and was the daughter of Lorenzo de Medici, that ruler of Florence for whom Machiavelli wrote the "Prince." She was sent to a convent at an early age, having lost both of her parents. It was foretold at her birth that she would bring destruction to the city where she was born, and the townspeople of Florence would have exposed the babe in a basket to the balls of their enemies. But she was preserved alive, was shut up in a convent, and in the school of Machiavelli learned dissimulation and fraud.

When only fourteen she was married to the Duke of Orleans, afterwards Henry II. Pope Clement VII. was her uncle, and Francis I., king of France, anxious to win his support, married his heir to the portionless orphan.

During the reign of Francis, Catherine exercised no influence in France. She was young, a foreigner, and was utterly

thrown in the shade by more important persons. She seemed a child of evil omen. Her uncle, the pope, soon died. Francis regretted the hasty marriage. Her husband neglected her for Diana Poitiers; and she had come into the family of Valois only to be contemned by her regal relatives as the impoverished descendant of a race of merchants. Only the nominal wife of a depraved king, she lived for many years powerless and obscure. For ten years after her marriage she had no children. A divorce began to be discussed at court. Catherine now resorted to her wonderful Italian tact. She presented herself to the king, threw herself at his feet, and swore her willingness to remain the wife of his son, or in case another wife should be chosen, to be one of her humblest attendants. She won the heart of Francis, and the divorce was heard of no more. She had the happiness of bringing him grandchildren before she died.

Her husband succeeded Francis, and during his reign, from 1549 to 1559, she led a passive but observant life. Henry was completely under the influence of his mistress, Diana of Poitiers. After the accession of her son, Francis II., she exercised little or no authority. Francis seemed completely under the spell of Mary Stuart, and the cardinal of Lorraine and the duke of Guise managed the affairs of France. Yet Catherine was singularly beautiful. She inherited the large and lustrous eyes of the Medicean family, and her graceful form, her brilliant complexion, her large and lustrous eyes, and her hand and arm that no sculptor could imitate, were set off by manners so soft and engaging as to even win the admiration of her foes. No one would suspect that her placid countenance concealed the passions and relentless hatred of the most ambitious of women. From Lorenzo the Magnificent she had inherited a taste for lavish elegance. She shone at tourneys and glittered in stately processions. The death of Francis opened to Catherine a career worthy of the most soaring ambition. She became the regent during the minority of the new king, Charles IX., her second son, then only ten years old.

At this time France had fallen into a critical condition. The hostility between the Reformation and the old religion was beginning to assume a dangerous character. After more than thirty years of unrelenting persecution, of dreadful atrocities perpetrated in every town by emissaries of the pope, the patient Huguenots had taken up arms in self-defense. They determined to meet the savage barbarians of the Inquisition with more effectual weapons than spiritual arms. For ten years all France was filled with civil discord. Factories were closed, the seats of industry sunk into decay, and an exterminating warfare wasted the vigor of the nation. The ambitious family of the Guises stood at the head of the Catholic faction. They inculcated an undying hatred toward the Huguenots, and incessantly called for their extermination. Pope Paul IV., actuated by strong wine and the insanity of a corrupt old age, had instigated the persecutions that led to the outbreak. Pius IV. and V. fanned the fires of fanaticism and aroused the maddened Catholics to deeds of cruelty and bloodshed.

The two Guises, duke Francis, and Charles, cardinal of Lorraine, controlled the court and king. Their aim was to extirpate heresy, and to lay France at the feet of the Roman pontiff, purified by a general massacre of his foes. Duke Francis and the cardinal were called by their contemporaries, "the Butchers." Nothing afforded them such savage satisfaction as the spectacle of a heretic dying of torture. It was the custom of the cardinal, after a stately dinner at his regal palace, to show his guests a fair array of martyrs, executed for their entertainment, or sometimes to hang up a burly Huguenot in the banqueting chamber itself. Such monsters as the Guises could only have been produced by Catholic Christianity. At the battle of Dreux (1562) the Huguenots were defeated by the duke of Guise; but at the seige of Orleans the duke fell by the hands of an assassin. Upon his death Catherine became the most important personage in France. Hers was now an eventful career, and civil wars succeeded each other to the close of her life. But it is with the

massacre of St. Bartholomew (twenty-fourth of August, 1572), that her name will be especially associated in history.

The terrible tragedy of Bartholomew was the direct consequence of the teachings of the popes. Catherine had become weary of incessant war. She resolved to end it by the total extermination of all the Huguenot leaders at one fell blow. She had been brought up in the school of Machiavelli. As if to exemplify the lessons she had learned, she now matured a dark and horrid plot for drawing into her toils all the chiefs and eminent men who had successfully resisted the force of the Catholic armies. And so she planned the massacre of St. Bartholomew. A secret joy filled the hearts of such faithful Catholics as she had trusted with a premonition of the approaching slaughter.

She proposed a pacification between the hostile parties. The union was to be completed by the marriage of her daughter Marguerite to young Henry, son of Jeanne, queen of Navarre, her hated rival. The queen of Navarre was the most austere of the Huguenots, but for the sake of peace for her party had yielded to the arts of Catherine. For the sake of the oppressed Huguenots, this grand queen suffered her son to marry the child of the house of Valois, and ventured to come up to Paris, the citadel of her bitterest foe. Her death soon followed. It was said by the annalists of the period that the mother of the expected bride had poisoned the mother of the bridegoom by presenting her with a pair of perfumed gloves, prepared with a deadly powder. There is no doubt that the spotless queen of Navarre was made away with by the Italian arts of Catherine. Jeanne d'Albret died as she had lived. Rejecting the proffered offices of the profligate ladies of Catherine's corrupt court, she expired asking the prayers of the Huguenot pastors and their simple ceremonies of burial.

Coligny was one of the most eminent chiefs of the reformers. He also was lured into the fatal snare. Trusting the word of his king he rode boldly into Paris. He had been warned by faithful friends. The wife of a peasant had clung

to the reins of his horse and warned him of his fate if he proceeded. But he came with his companions in arms right into the center of his foes. Henry of Navarre and his cousin, the prince of Condé, came to Paris in the first days of August. They were assigned the palace of the Louvre. Charles IX. welcomed Coligny almost as a father, and gave him a hotel on the street of Breese. Catherine received her noble victims with eager civility, and the city rang with revelry.

The great horror was near at hand, and was preceded by a dreadful hilarity, inspired by Catherine and her corrupt train of beautiful women. The wedding took place on the eighteenth of August, 1572. The ceremony was performed beneath a richly-adorned pavilion before the church of Notre Dame. Attired in yellow satin, covered with precious stones, and attended by a long procession of princes and nobles, Charles IX. and Henry ascended the platform. The king led in his sister, who was robed in violet velvet, embroidered with the lilies of France and glittering with pearls and diamonds Catherine came next, followed by her frail, fair circle of maids of honor. It was a gay and brilliant pageant that there gathered under the summer sun that gleamed over the towers of Notre Dame. Cardinal Bourbon performed the ceremony. The Louvre was the scene of a grand entertainment in the evening. Royal revelers filled its wide saloons, and for days the gay capital was given up to feasts and tourneys and merriment.

But the week of the wedding carousal was to close in the butchery of Bartholomew. Paris was crowded with the best and the bravest of the Huguenots. Orders were dispatched to the governor of Lyons to prevent couriers passing to Rome until the twenty-fourth of August. It was designed to apprise the pope of the wedding and massacre at the same moment. The first deed of crime was committed on the twenty-second of August. Coligny was shot at by order of the young duke of Guise. The admiral was borne back to his hotel bleeding, but not mortally wounded. The king came to express his sympathy for his suffering friend.

Catherine also came and wept over the wounded Coligny. The Huguenots were startled from their security. They gathered around the bedside of their beloved chief and in the chamber of Henry of Navarre. They could now scarcely go into the city without danger.

A great gloom seemed settling over Paris. The French capital at this time was noted for its narrow and filthy streets, for its sordid and starving population, and the fierce superstition of its monks and priests. It was neither paved nor lighted, and was the perpetual haunt of fever and plague. A strange and ominous stillness rested upon the gloomy lanes of Paris on the night of the twenty-third of August. The body-guard of the king had been stationed under arms. Citizens were furnished with arms at the public cost. The houses of the Huguenots were marked.

Charles hesitated in his horrible design. He was weary of bloodshed, and wavered. Some traits of humanity still lingered in his breast. Catherine arose after midnight, and went to his room. He delayed to give the final order. His feeble imperfect intellect was crazed. At one time he cried out that he would call on the Huguenots to protect his life. He paced the room with rapid strides, incapable of decision. He was scarcely twenty-two years of age, and had been accustomed from infancy to tremble before his mother's glance. She now told him that it was too late to recede, and that the order must be instantly given. Her voice of rage was filled with a sinister meaning. He knew that it would cost him his life to refuse, that his mother would remove him by her secret arts to place her favorite Anjou on the throne. In a sudden burst of fear and frenzy the feeble king gave the fatal command. Whatever was good and gentle in the nature of Charles now died forever. He became simply an instrument of Rome for the commission of an unequalled deed of crime. The signal for the slaughter was given, and the work of carnage commenced. Guise began it by the murder of Coligny. The clatter of his horse's hoofs broke the stillness of the Sabbath morning as he furiously galloped at the head

of his soldiers to the quarters of the admiral. Coligny was stabbed in his bed-chamber, and his body thrown from the window into the court below.

And now the great clock of the church of St. Germain l'Auxerrois gave an ominous peal, which awoke such an awful clamor over silent Paris as had never been known on earth before. From every tower and belfry resounded the clangor of bells. The Catholic citizens seized their weapons and hastened to the houses of the Huguenots. All the inmates were to be mercilessly murdered, from the innocent infant to the gray-haired grandsire. The city was illuminated, and the blaze of torches lit up the labor of death. Charles, Catherine, and their coadjutors at the court, kept closely together. They gathered at a window overlooking the tennis court. Charles shot at the flying Huguenots from the window. The splendid saloons of the palace which a few days before had rung with nuptial festivity now echoed with the shrieks of dying Huguenots.

It will be impossible to tell the details of this terrible event. Mad and malignant women, and young children nursed on the milk of malice, lent their aid to the religious massacre by torturing the dying and abusing the bodies of the dead. The previous morning Henry of Navarre, had been arrested and confined in the king's chamber. Marguerite had a premonition of the impending danger. The evening before, she clung to her sister Claude, oppressed with a sense of the approaching horror. The murderess Catherine had violently driven her to the apartment of her husband, lest her absence might excite suspicion. She passed the night in sleepless terror. Henry's rooms were filled with his companions in arms. At length the door was thrown open, and a man covered with blood rushed into the room, pursued by soldiers. He threw his arms around the screaming queen, clung to her, begged piteously for life. Marguerite released herself and fled hastily across the halls of the Louvre to her sister's room. The rooms that had so lately rang with the revels of her wedding night now resounded with the clamor of the

general massacre. She saw fugitive Huguenots pierced by the spears of their pursuers. Horror-stricken and faint, she threw herself at the feet of her mother, and tremblingly and tearfully begged the lives of two of her husband's retainers. Of Henry's band of Huguenot attendants but a few escaped. They were driven out into the court, where, between two lines of Swiss guards, they were cut to pieces without mercy. In the morning there lay piled under the windows of the palace over two hundred of the purest and noblest gentlemen of France. Catherine and her corrupt court came out and insulted their dead bodies.

After Coligny had been cast into the street his head was cut off and embalmed with spices to be presented to the pope. The murderous mob then cut off his arms and dragged his mutilated body through the streets of Paris. He was afterwards hung up by the heels outside of the city and exposed to the scorn of the populace. The whole city was now in arms. Sixty thousand furious and frantic Catholics ran up and down the streets committing atrocities beyond the power of imagination to paint. Every papist became an assassin, and every hat or cap was marked with a white cross. The infirm were murdered in the bed of sickness; the aged stabbed while tottering on their crutches; children snatched from their mothers, and tossed on the points of spears; infants strangled in their cradles, and men and women indiscriminately murdered.

All through that fearful Sabbath day, the feast of St. Bartholomew, and for two succeeding days, the murders went on. Charles rode through the streets a raging lunatic. Oaths, shrieks, and the discharge of firearms were heard in all directions. Houses were smeared with the blood of their owners, and the streets were strewed with corpses. The Seine was turned to blood. Nothing but the blood of women and babes appeared to appease the tigerish rage of the murderers. Infants were dragged through the streets with cords around their necks and thrown into the Seine from baskets. An infant smiled in the face of the man who had seized it, and

played with his beard, but the monster stabbed the child, and with an oath hurled it into the Seine. Three hundred and fifty Protestants were confined in a place called the Archbishop's Prison. To this place a number of soldiers repaired, picked their pockets of what money they had, took from them such garments as they thought proper to appropriate to their own use, and then drawing their swords, cut them to pieces without the least remorse,

For three days the butchery continued with all the excessive atrocities that religious zeal and hate can inspire. It extended throughout the kingdom. Every effort was made, by orders of the king, to exterminate the Huguenots. Four thousand reformers were murdered at Lyons. Bordeaux, Orleans, Auger, and all the provincial towns ran with blood. The most eloquent of the Jesuit preachers employed all their eloquence in urging on the work of slaughter. The number of the slain throughout France is estimated to have been upwards of one hundred thousand.

History offers no parallel to this wholesale religious massacre, even in its bloodiest and most barbarous periods. After the slaughter had subsided, the assassins paraded the streets of Paris, boasting that they had dyed their white cockades red with the blood of the Huguenots. A papist apothecary suggested that money might be realized from the fat contained in the multitude of dead bodies that lay about; accordingly the plumpest bodies were selected, and the grease extracted from them was sold for three shillings per pound. The inhabitants of the villages which lay below Paris, on the borders of the Seine, were astonished to see the number of dead bodies that floated down the stream. Even some Catholics were led to exclaim, "It surely could not be men, but devils in their appearance, who have committed these cruelties."

The news of the fate of the Huguenots was received by pope Gregory XIII. with unbounded joy. Rome rang with rejoicings. The guns of the castle of San Angelo gave forth a joyous salute. Bells sounded from every tower, and bonfires

blazed throughout the night. Attended by a pompous procession of priests and cardinals, Gregory proceeded to the church of St. Louis', where the cardinal of Lorraine chanted a *Te Deum*. The death gurgle of the butchered hosts of Bartholomew was music to the court of the Vatican. His holiness sent Charles the Golden Rose for his dutiful conduct. A medal was struck to commemorate the glorious massacre, and from all the pulpits of Rome, Charles, Catherine, and the Guises were eloquently proclaimed the new founders of the papal Church.

But the effect of the dreadful deed upon the feeble intellect of Charles proved fatal. His health began to decline. His conscience never slept. His mind was racked by terror and remorse. He heard strange noises in the air like the death cries of dying Huguenots. His room seemed smeared with blood, and the ghosts of the murdered haunted his bedside. "I am lost! I am lost!" he shrieked amidst sobs and tears to his faithful Huguenot nurse who had watched over him from the cradle. Catherine came to console him with the news of the capture of one of his enemies. He only said to her, "Madam, such things concern me no longer. I am dying." He received the last rites of the Church, and soon after died. This was in 1574. Then Catherine's favorite son, the duke of Anjou, for whom she had so long plotted and schemed, became king, under the name of Henry III. There is little doubt that Charles was carried off by poison administered by the hands of his mother. Catherine continued her old career of policy and poisoning.

She died in 1589; her son, Henry III., was assassinated, and her guilty race faded forever from the earth. But her murderous spirit still seems to have lingered in unhappy Paris. It was this murderous spirit which ripened into the enormities of *dragonnades*, the horrors of the Reign of Terror, and the bloody excesses of the modern commune; and it seems as though only through the blood of its own citizens can the splendid capital expiate the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the crime of tolerating such a monster as Catherine de Medici.

QUEEN ELIZABETH.

This queen of England was the daughter of Henry VIII. by Anne Boleyn, born in 1533. Her mother was beheaded when she was three years of age, and she was declared a bastard by act of parliament. The succession was secured to her, however, by a later act. Great care was taken with her education, and under the tuition of Roger Ascham she attained remarkable proficiency in Latin, French, Italian, and Greek. She was brought up in the Protestant faith. Though many marriage projects were early set on foot for her, and she had numerous suitors, Elizabeth never married.

Soon after the suppression of what is known as Wyatt's insurrection, she was arrested and sent to the Tower. She was afterwards removed to Woodstock, and from thence to Hatfield House, but was kept in confinement during the reign of her sister Mary. Upon the death of Mary, the lords of the council went down to Hatfield House to hail the Princess Elizabeth as the new queen of England. The event caused great rejoicing throughout the kingdom.

Elizabeth was twenty-five years of age when she came up to Westminster Abbey to be crowned. Though her personal appearance was not wholly unprepossessing, yet she was far from being the beautiful and amiable creature her courtiers have made her out to be. Her features were strongly marked, her hair was red, and her nose too long and sharp for a woman's. She was a hard swearer and a coarse talker, and inherited her father's violent temper. Still, she must have seemed like an angel, coming as she did after the dark and malignant Mary. She was well educated and clever, but cunning, violent, and false-hearted. It is difficult to determine

just what kind of a woman she really was, she has been so over-praised by the Protestants and over-abused by the Catholics. Elizabeth was as bigoted a Protestant as Mary had been a Catholic. And of course, upon her accession, the new religion was again put up and the old religion put down. The adherents of Rome were now her bitter enemies. The same-old struggle between the two religions was still kept up. Pope Paul IV. refused to recognize her title. The succeeding popes, Pius V. and Sixtus V., published bulls of excommunication against her, and absolved her subjects from their allegiance.

Her reign was one of turmoil and bloodshed. The chief cause of these troubles, and the greatest thorn in the royal crown of Elizabeth was Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. Mary was the daughter of Mary of Guise, queen regent of Scotland. When but a mere child she had been married to the dauphin of France. Had not the English parliament altered the succession she would have had a good claim to the English crown in right of her birth. Mary was greatly attached to the Romish religion. Therefore the pope and the Catholic party stoutly maintained that she was the rightful queen of England, and that Elizabeth was the wrongful queen. At length her young husband became Francis II., king of France, and he and Mary also declared themselves king and queen of England. There was a good deal of rioting and murdering going on in Scotland at this time in consequence of a collision between the two religions. The pope helped the mischief along all in his power.

At length Francis died, and Mary was left a young widow. Being unhappy where she was, she accepted an invitation from her Scottish subjects to return home and reign over them. Elizabeth had been queen three years when Mary came over and took up her abode at the palace of Holyrood in Edinburgh. She had given a solemn pledge to the heads of the papal Church that if she ever succeeded to the English throne she would reëstablish the Catholic religion. And now she was constantly put forward by the Romish party

against Elizabeth. A narrative of the troubles she had with her stubborn subjects, her husbands, lovers, and John Knox, must be omitted here for want of room.

At length she was taken prisoner by the Scotch lords, forced to sign her abdication, and shut up in a castle in the midst of a lake. Managing to make her escape, she rode rapidly to Hamilton, where she raised three thousand men. But her brother, the Earl of Murray, regent and head of the Protestant party in Scotland, came upon her, and in one-quarter of an hour routed her forces and cut down all her hopes. Mary fled to England. This was in 1568. She came to Elizabeth for protection, but came to her ruin and her death.

The fugitive queen had fled from Scotland without money and without clothes other than she wore. She was now in the power of her own "dear cousin," Elizabeth. No historian has satisfactorily accounted for Elizabeth's implacable malice toward the unfortunate Queen of Scots. It was decided to detain Mary a prisoner in England. She was first confined at Carlisle, and after that was moved about from castle to castle, as was considered necessary.

From the moment of Mary's arrival in England she became the center of plots and miseries. There was a great conspiracy of the pope and some of the Catholic kings of Europe to depose Elizabeth, place Mary on the throne, and restore the old religion. The people of England lived in continual terror. Every day brought news of plots. Finally a plot was discovered, which, it was pretended, implicated Mary. She had been kept a close prisoner for nineteen years.

She was now arraigned at Fotheringay Castle on the charge of fomenting conspiracies against Elizabeth. She underwent the mock formality of a trial before the commissioners, all the time asserting her innocence and disclaiming their authority. Though no proof of the charges appeared on the trial, yet she was pronounced guilty, and condemned to death. The warrant for her execution was brought to Elizabeth to sign. After keeping it a few days, joking about it,

and swearing a little, she gave the fatal order. On the seventh of February, 1587, the earls of Kent and Shrewsbury, with the sheriff of Northamptonshire, went down to Fotheringay to carry it into execution. Mary received the tidings of her fate with composure. The next morning she dressed herself in her best clothes; and at eight o'clock, when the sheriff came for her to her chapel, she took leave of her servants who were there assembled, and went down stairs, carrying a Bible in one hand and a crucifix in the other. Two of her women and four of her men were allowed to be present in the hall, where a low scaffold only two feet from the ground was erected and covered with black. The executioner from the Tower, and his assistant, stood waiting, dressed in black velvet. The hall was full of people. While the sentence was being read, Mary sat upon a stool. When it was finished she again denied her guilt. When her head and neck were uncovered by the executioners, she said that she had not been used to be undressed by such hands, or before so much company. Finally, one of her women fastened a cloth over her face; and she laid her neck upon the block, and repeated several times in Latin, "Into thy hands, O Lord! I commend my spirit." Some say her head was struck off in two blows, some say in three. The executioner held it up, streaming with blood, and then it was seen that the real hair beneath the false hair she had long worn was as gray as that of a woman of seventy, though she was at that time only in her forty-sixth year. The wondrous beauty for which she had been celebrated was all gone. She was followed to the last by her faithful little spaniel, who cowered under her dress, frightened, when she went upon the scaffold, and lay down beside her headless body when all was over. Thus fell Mary Stuart. Her bloody death will everlastingly curse the memory of Elizabeth of England.

Philip, king of Spain, and the prince of Parma, now made great preparations to punish Protestant England for the death of the Catholic queen. They fitted out an immense armada, consisting of one hundred and thirty ships, nineteen thousand

soldiers, eight thousand sailors, two thousand slaves, and between two and three thousand great guns. The national spirit of England was up, and the whole nation fired up like one strong angry man to repel the invasion. All the men between sixteen years old and sixty were trained and drilled, and the national fleet was enlarged by public contributions and by private ships fitted out by noblemen. Both sides of the Thames were strongly fortified, and the sailors in the ships and the country awaited the "Invincible Armada." On it came into the English Channel, sailing along in the form of a half-moon, of such great size that it was seven miles long. Elizabeth rode down to Gravesend in armor on a white horse, and made a stirring speech to the troops. And then the English attacked the great Armada, which, it soon appeared, was not invincible. All the Spanish ships that dropped a little out of the half-moon were instantly taken. Bold Admiral Drake, the celebrated circumnavigator of the world, sent eight blazing fire-ships right into the midst of it. A terrible consternation seized the Spaniards. They tried to get out to sea, and became dispersed. The victorious English pursued them. A great storm came on and drove them among rocks and shoals. Defeated and disgraced, they attempted to sail home again. Being afraid to go by the English Channel, the fleet sailed all around Scotland and Ireland. A violent storm drove it upon the bleak coast of the Orkneys, and only a feeble remnant of the magnificent armament reached Spain.

At this time the favorite of Elizabeth was the earl of Essex, a handsome man, spirited and possessed of many admirable qualities. He was urgent for war with Spain. One day he and the queen had high words over the matter. Essex took offense, and turned his back upon her; whereupon Elizabeth gave him a tremendous box on the ear, and told him to go to the devil. But instead of going to the devil, he went home and staid for more than a year. The queen never forgave a fancied injury; and though Essex was again taken into favor, and made lord lieutenant of Ireland,

yet his fate was sealed. He came home from Ireland without Elizabeth's orders. She gave him her hand to kiss, was overjoyed to see him, and all that, yet she gave orders to have him taken into custody. Upon his falling ill, she sent him broth from her own table, and shed tears about him. Elizabeth had now become a capricious old woman. Essex had his trial. The charge upon which he was found guilty of treason and condemned to death, was conspiring to obtain possession of the person of the queen, and force her to dismiss her ministers and change her favorites. On the twenty-fifth of February, 1601, he was executed on Tower Hill, where he met death courageously and penitently, at the age of thirty-four years. His step-father suffered with him, Elizabeth had commanded, countermanded, and again commanded, his execution.

The death of her young and gallant favorite was never off Elizabeth's mind afterwards. She lived a moody, sorrowful, broken figure. At last on the tenth of March, 1603, having been ill of a very bad cold, and made worse by the death of the countess of Nottingham, who was her intimate friend, Elizabeth fell into a stupor, and was supposed to be dead. She recovered her consciousness, however, and then nothing would induce her to go to bed; for she said that she knew if she did she would never get up again. For ten days she lay on cushions on the floor, without any food. The lord admiral finally got her into bed, partly by persuasion and partly by main force. On the twenty-third of March she was speechless. At three o'clock next morning she quietly died, in the forty-fifth year of her reign.

Some writers have made Elizabeth out to be a very good woman—others have made her out to be a very bad woman. Probably the truth is she was neither as good nor as bad as represented by religious extremists. She had some good qualities, and her reign was, upon the whole, a prosperous one; but she was too much like her father to be a very good woman. She was vain and violent, vixenish, coarse, capricious, and cruel. Long after she was an old woman she dis-

played all the excessive vanity of a young one. There are accounts of her cutting a ridiculous figure before her court on state occasions by dancing in an immense ruff, stomacher and wig, when she was past seventy years old. A recital of her cruelties excites a shudder of horror in every generous heart, even after the lapse of three centuries.

The tragic deaths of Essex and the Queen of Scots will remain in history as an everlasting monument of her treachery, baseness, and barbarity. If space permitted, the amplest proof could here be given from her contemporaries of the profanity and coarse manners of the maiden monarch. According to Miss Strickland, in her "Queens of England," she swore worse than her father—which is saying a great deal.

This "virgin queen," whose virtue is still the favorite theme with many writers, was in the habit of using expressions which would shock and startle us, and appear in the last degree revolting, were we to hear them even from the lips of a bad man. The crouching Lord Bacon extols her piety and the reverence with which she pronounced the name of God. The following unique epistle from her maiden majesty to Bishop Cox will serve as an example:

"Proud Prelate: You know what you were before I made you what you are now. If you do not immediately comply with my request, I will unfrock you, *by God.* ELIZABETH." (See "Queens of England," vi, 244).

She sought to play the part of Protestant popess of England. She assumed to be "the supreme governor in spirituals and temporals" of the Anglican Church. As such she will compare with any Torquemada or Beza who ever worked the racks and pulleys of the Inquisition. She estab lished a High Commission, which was "authorized to inquire, on the oath of the person accused, and on the oath of witnesses, of all heretical, erroneous, and dangerous opinions," and to execute proper punishment upon persons found guilty of such offenses. In fact, the terrors of this High Commission almost rivalled those of the Spanish Inquisition. Elizabeth's inquisitors were empowered to employ the rack, and

that in the most wanton manner, to extort confessions from the accused victims.

"The Catholic prisoner was hardly lodged in the Tower before he was placed on the rack; and if he was supposed to be a priest was interrogated, why he had come to England, where he resided, what he had learned from the confession of others, and in what place his colleagues were concealed" (Hallam's Constitutional History of England, p. 145. See, also, Bridgewater, xxvii, 197, 296).

Though the rack was used more or less throughout Europe in the sixteenth century, nowhere was it brought into requisition with as much frequency and abandoned barbarity as in England under Elizabeth. Her ingenuity even invented new and exquisite instruments of torture. The following presents a succinct view of the system of torture adopted by Elizabeth, chiefly employed in the Tower:

1. The rack was a large open frame of oak, raised three feet from the ground. The prisoner was laid upon it on his back, on the floor; his wrists and ankles were attached by cords to two rollers at the ends of the frame; these were moved by levers in opposite directions, till the body rose to a level with the frame. Questions were then put; and if the answers did not prove satisfactory, the sufferer was stretched more and more till the bones started from their sockets.

2. The scavenger's daughter was a broad hoop of iron, consisting of two parts, fastened to each other by a hinge. The prisoner was made to kneel on the pavement, and to contract himself into as small a compass as he could. Then the executioner, kneeling on his shoulders and having introduced the hoop under his legs, compressed the victim close together, till he was able to fasten the extremities over the small of the back. The time allotted to this kind of torture was an hour and a half, during which time it commonly happened that from excess of compression the blood started from the nostrils; sometimes from the extremities of the hands and feet.

3. Iron gauntlets, which could be contracted by the aid of a screw. They served to compress the wrists, and to suspend the prisoner in the air from two distant points of a beam. He was placed on three pieces of wood, piled one on the other, which, when his hands had been made fast, were successively withdrawn from under his feet. "I felt," says F. Gerard, one of the sufferers, "the chief pain in my breast, belly, arms, and hands. I thought that all the blood in my body had run into my arms, and began to burst out at my finger ends. This was a mistake; but the arms swelled till the gauntlets were buried within the flesh. After being thus suspended an hour, I fainted; and when I came to myself, I found the executioners supported me in their arms; they replaced the pieces of wood under my feet; but as soon as I was recovered removed them again. Thus I continued hanging for the space of five hours, during which time I fainted eight or nine times."

4. A fourth kind of torture was a cell called "little ease." It was of so small dimensions, and so constructed, that the prisoner could neither stand, walk, sit, nor lie in it at full length. He was compelled to draw himself up in a squatting posture, and so remain during several days.

Says Miss Strickland, in her "Queens of England," respecting her merciless treatment of Catherine Grey, sister of the unfortunate Lady Jane Grey:

"Elizabeth was obdurate in her resentment of her unfortunate cousin, Lady Catherine Grey; and, disregarding all her pathetic letters for pardon and pity, kept her in durance apart from her husband and children till she was released by death, after seven years of doleful captivity. Her real crime was being the sister of Lady Jane Grey, which Elizabeth could not overlook; yet Lady Catherine was a Protestant."

Many women were put to death under the penal code of Elizabeth. In 1586, Mrs. Ward was hanged, drawn, and quartered for assisting a Catholic priest to escape; Mrs. Lyne suffered the same punishment, in 1601, for the same offense; and Mrs. Wells received sentence of death in 1591, and died

in prison. A lady named Cithero was executed for harboring priests. The worse than savages stripped her; two sergeants parted her hands and bound them to two posts in the ground, and in the same manner her feet; a sharp stone was put under her back; upon her were laid a door and huge weights, which, breaking her ribs, caused them to burst through the skin. (See Waterworth's Lectures on the Reformation, p. 401.)

During the last fourteen years only of Elizabeth's reign, sixty-one clergymen, forty-seven laymen, and several women suffered capital punishment for some or other of the spiritual felonies and treasons which had been lately created. During her entire reign, it is ascertained from contemporary lists, that one hundred and twenty-four clergymen suffered the cruel death of traitors, of whom one hundred and fourteen were secular priests, eight Jesuits, one monk, and one friar. By artful and ensnaring questions an avowal was drawn from the prisoner, that he had been reconciled to the Romish Church, or had harbored a priest, or that he admitted the ecclesiastical supremacy of the pope, or rejected that of the queen. Any one of these crimes was sufficient to send him to the scaffold. His death soon followed; and the butchery was performed on the victim while he was yet in the possession of his senses. (See Lingard, p. 295.)

All the jails in the kingdom were often filled with prisoners. Infectious diseases resulted from the crowd and foul air. Thus twenty Catholics of family and fortune perished on one single occasion in the castle of York. A similar fate befel the prisoners in Newgate, in July, 1580. At one of the sessions in Hampshire four hundred, and at one of the assizes in Lancashire six hundred accusations were presented.

Hallam makes this statement in his "Constitutional History of England," p. 93: "The rack seldom stood idle in the Tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign. To those who remember the annals of their country, that dark and gloomy pile affords associations not quite so numerous or recent as the Bastile once did, yet enough to excite our

hatred and horror. Such excessive severities, under the pretext of treason, but sustained by very little evidence of any other offense that the exercise of the Catholic ministry, excited indignation throughout a great part of Europe."

Says that candid Protestant writer, Agnes Strickland: "It is ever to be lamented that Elizabeth stained the glorious year of the Armada with a series of cruel persecutions on the score of religion. January 14, 1588, a Deist named Francis Wright was burned alive in the castle ditch at Norwich. He was the fourth who had suffered in the same place within the last five years for promulgating erroneous opinions. The same year, six Catholic priests were hanged, drawn, and quartered; four laymen, who had embraced Protestantism, for returning to their old belief; four others, and a gentlewoman of the name of Ward, for concealing Catholic priests, besides fifteen of their companions, who were arraigned for no other offense than their theological opinions."

Of the number persecuted to death by this English Jezebel, Hallam writes as follows: "The Catholic martyrs under Elizabeth amounted to no inconsiderable number. Dodd reckons them at one hundred and ninety-one; Milner has raised the list to two hundred and four. Fifteen of them, according to him, suffered for denying the queen's supremacy, one hundred and twenty-six for exercising their ministry, and the rest for being reconciled to the Romish Church. Many others died of hardships in prison, and many were deprived of their property."

Such was the "good Queen Bess," of whose virtues and glorious reign so much has been written. The above statement of facts are fully accredited by Spalding, Macaulay, and Agnes Strickland. She was the mighty bulwark and consolidator of the Protestant Church in England. Her life and character are now submitted to the calm consideration of the readers of these pages.

JULIUS III.

Few of the popes would have escaped the prison or the gibbet had they been amenable to modern laws. There were a few good popes—very few. The vast majority were monstrous criminals. A correct record of the doings of those successors of the meek and lowly Jesus would eclipse the Newgate Calendar in variety and enormity of crime, and then the worst dare not be told. It would be criminal to more than hint at the more filthy and revolting of their crimes. Volumes might be filled with the criminal records of almost any one of those holy pontiffs, but space is necessarily limited here, so only brief references can be made to some of the actions of a few of the popes.

Cardinal del Monte was chosen pope in 1549. Assuming the title of Julius III., he continued the career of debauchery he had long been following, and his increase of power gave him greater facilities for enjoying immunity for his crimes. He had one virtue, but it only made his vices more apparent. He was no hypocrite, and took no pains to conceal his depravity. His only ambition appeared to be a desire to outdo his predecessors in debauchery, and that he failed to do so was not owing to a lack of willingness. The cares of state he left to others, and occupied himself with his favorite courtesans and minions.

His language and manners were in accordance with the dissoluteness and corruption of his morals. De Cormenin says: "Even in the conclave he practiced iniquity of the most bestial description, and, instead of concealing it, permitted himself to be detected by his colleagues." The celebrated writer, Bayle, has preserved and given to the world a series

of letters which passed between Julius and a courtesan of Rome, whose favors were divided between the pope and one of his cardinals, and whose children were reared at their common expense. These letters are so vile, filthy, and disgusting, that it would be a prison offense to publish them, yet they were written by the supreme head of the Church.

Julius had a minion, Bertuccino, keeper of the Vatican monkeys, who ministered to his bestial libidinousness, and he determined to make him cardinal. Being drunk, one day, this pious pope convened the sacred college and broached the project to the cardinals. Opposition was made by some of the more upright among them, whereupon this pious saint made the following memorable speech:

"By the womb of the Virgin, I swear my minion shall be cardinal. What have you to reproach him with, to refuse his admittance into your college? His vices? Are you not all devoured by shameful maladies, and plunged into all kinds of shameful abominations? Let him among you who has not prostituted himself carnally at least once in his life cast the first stone at him! Ah! you keep silence. Do you admit, then, that we are all of us a disgrace to humanity? Commence with me; what great virtues, what prodigious knowledge did you encounter in me to make me pope? Am I not a thousand times more infamous than my minion, the keeper of monkeys, whom I corrupted? Well, then, if he be better than I, who am, thanks to you, sovereign father of the faithful, how dare you refuse to make a cardinal and a bishop of him? (De Cormenin, Hist. Popes, vol. ii., p. 218.)

It is needless to say that the reasoning of the holy saint was conclusive. Bertuccino was made cardinal, and afterwards passed his time in the apartments of the pope.

During the pontificate of Julius the Reformation was steadily progressing in Germany; and though the society of Jesuits was gaining strength and rapidly extending its roots and branches in all directions, the power of the papacy was slowly but surely waning. He died March 22, 1555.

PIUS IV.

THE two hundred and thirty-second pope, Bernard Medici, was placed at the head of the Church in 1559, under the title of Pius IV. He was no exception to the general rule. Some writer has remarked that some popes were worse than others, but they were all bad. However much truth there may be in this remark, it will be difficult for Catholics to believe it; but that as a rule they were a very immoral and depraved series, a close examination of history will convince the most skeptical.

Besides being perfidious, cruel, and debauched, Pius IV. was avaricious and gluttonous. Says De Cormenin: "The table was, say historians, the only thing for which this pontiff departed from his habits of sordid avarice; for with all his taste for licentiousness, adds the chronicle, he found means to possess the handsomest women and most beautiful youth of Rome, without costing him anything. He was obliged to make them large presents in order to attract them to the Vatican; but when he had enjoyed them he put them to the torture, and forced them, by frightful punishments, to give up all they had received. As to his table, it was a different thing; no expense was spared. The rarest dishes, the most exquisite wines, were served up in the most ridiculous profusion; and the pope did the honors of his feasts so well that he was carried dead drunk to his apartment every night" (Hist. Popes, ii, 234).

This pope was blessed with a large circle of relatives as avaricious and greedy as himself. These he took pains to provide with lucrative sinecures at the expense of the faithful. When expostulated with by the magistrates of Rome

for his nepotism, he said, "I must do to-day for my relatives all that is in my power, for to-morrow death may overtake me, and there will be no more time." The predecessor of Pius, Paul IV., had acted in the same manner, enriching his relatives with the wealth wrung from the toiling masses. As soon as Pius had provided for his own family, he proceeded to replenish his coffers by despoiling the relatives of the deceased Paul. He seized and imprisoned several of them, extorted from them their possessions by a free use of the torture, and removed them from his way by means of the headsman's axe or poison. Pius sustained the reputation of his predecessors.

During the pontificate of Pius IV. the Reformation was spreading rapidly over Europe. In pursuance of a plan to suppress the rapidly-growing heresy, he sent Jesuits to all the courts of Europe, commissioned to engage the Catholic princes to form a league for the extermination of the heretics. The history of this attempt to suppress heresy will be found in other parts of this volume. Pius was directly concerned in the massacres in the Venaissin countship. These massacres were committed under his immediate supervision. He sent among the unfortunate inhabitants of this countship, who had dared to have opinions of their own on religious subjects, an army of assassins recruited from his monks and the banditti of the mountains. The writer Varillas gives the following account of their operations:

"The soldiers of the pope marked their passage through Provence by all kinds of depredations and cruelties; but what is most singular, they spared the she-goats, and formed immense flocks of them, which accompanied them in their march, and which they used in their debaucheries. The goat of the general had gilded horns; it was covered with garlands of flowers, and was led by silken cords. This band of wretches fell on the small city of Orange, laid seige to it, and carried it by assault. There were committed such frightful atrocities as make the hair rise on the head at only reading them. The soldiers and monks forced the citizens to mount

on the tops of the houses, and to throw themselves down on pikes, halberds, and swords; they hung old men and children to the hooks in the chimneys, roasted them by a slow fire, cut off slices of the flesh and ate them before their victims were dead; they mutilated the men and tore from them their organs of virility; they defloured women and young girls of extreme youth, and thrust into their bodies poles of enormous dimensions, which tore their bowels. Those who made any resistance were pitilessly murdered, and then exposed in the public places entirely naked, with ox horns thrust into the body. Finally, these satellites of pontifical tyranny, in their execrable fury, assuaged their lubricity on boys of scarcely ten years old, and when these unfortunates had been tortured by this horrid outrage, they fastened them to racks and larded them while alive with pages of the Bibles of Geneva, as you would do the flesh of pork or of birds."

As the principal events of this pope's reign are detailed elsewhere, it will be useless to repeat them here. As he grew older he became more and more dissipated and addicted to the pleasures of the table, until, at the close of a repast, during which he swallowed twelve flasks of wine, he was taken with an attack of apoplexy and died in a few hours afterwards, in December, 1565.

No doubt the record of the doings of some of the characters in this work will excite disgust in the minds of the readers, but in dealing with the vileness and corruption that have always existed and still exist in the orthodox churches, many things must be laid bare and exposed to the full light of modern thought which a fastidious taste will deprecate. The monstrous and filthy corruptions of the Church would never be known unless the gilded covering of sanctity was torn away. The truth must be told. The putrid mass of corruption still existing in the Church can never be removed until it is exposed to the full light of day and commented on in plain language.

PIUS V.

When the public rejoicings over the death of the infamous Pius IV. had somewhat subsided, the cardinals proceeded to the election of a successor. According to custom, each went to work to intrigue either to sell his own vote or to purchase those of others. Money being used freely, the grand inquisitor, Michael Ghislieri, a debauched and ferocious Dominican, was proclaimed head of the Church by the name of Pius V.

The previous career of Michael was of that peculiar kind which would fit any ordinary mortal for the chair of Peter. He was born of parents so poor and miserable that he was constrained to enter as a scullion in a convent of the order of St. Dominic. His appearance attracted the attention of the prior, one of the most debauched of that infamous order. He made him his minion, and, to cover his vile amours from the eyes of his brethren, he took care of his education. Being appointed inquisitor in the city of Como, the young Michael commenced displaying that ferocious cruelty which afterwards stamped him as one of the most bloodthirsty pontiffs that ever cursed a suffering world. After having discharged the duties of inquisitor for several years, he was made grand inquisitor under Paul IV. His cruelties in the exercise of his new office were so monstrous that his name soon became a terror throughout Italy.

His elevation to the pontificate appeared to make him more heartless and sanguinary. He gave no relaxation to the executioners of the Holy Office. He fell upon the heretics, cast them by thousands into prison, and personally presided over their execution. Among other examples of the ferocity of Pius V., the historian, Volatteran, relates the following con-

cerning a young woman who was accused of having assisted her sister, a heretic, to escape from Rome:

"This unfortunate female was torn by night from her family, and, without any regard to her state of pregnancy, was plunged into a dark and infected cell, where she was delivered of her child from fright. In the morning, the cruel Pius brought her before the tribunal, and, without being moved by the protestations of innocence and the prayers of this unfortunate woman, he ordered the monks, who filled the office of tormentors, to do their duty. Three Dominicans then seized her, tore off her clothes, and left her entirely naked. They then bent her body on the rack, fastened her feet and arms to cords, which were retained to the wall in iron rings, and drew her with so much violence that her delicate and weak members were cut to the bone. They then inflicted on her the torture of water. But after she had swallowed eight whole measures, she vomited it up with torrents of blood, and fainted. His holiness then ordered the executioners to apply plates of heated brass to the most sensitive parts of her body, and to light a fire under her feet, which recalled her from her swoon. Finally, as she persisted in her innocence, they took her down from the rack, and carried her back to her dungeon to her child, who had died from cold whilst they were torturing her. She herself died the next day. Pius, having discovered that she had been falsely accused contented himself with restoring her dead body to her family."

Pius V. excited general terror and disgust throughout Italy during his pontificate by the seizure, imprisonment, and burning of those suspected of heresy, among whom were several persons of note. He enforced strictly the Index Expurgatorius, and expelled the Jews from the States of the Church excepting only the cities of Rome and Ancona. His death, in May, 1572, was a matter of general rejoicing, and was publicly celebrated during three days.

GREGORY XIII.

THIS bad man took the pontifical chair in 1572. His leading desire was the extermination of heretics—every man and woman who had the temerity to think differently from what the popes, bishops, and priests prescribed. Among the first bloody events that transpired after his becoming the infallible vicegerent of God was the carrying out of the damnable plot which terminated in the massacre on the eve of St. Bartholomew, by which, in the space of forty-eight hours, thirty thousand Huguenots were mercilessly slaughtered in the streets of Paris. Couriers with messages of blood were dispatched in all directions to the governors of provinces ordering the massacring to be continued, and within the next two months more than seventy thousand men, women, and children were butchered in cold blood; and when the infernal work was accomplished, and the intelligence was conveyed to him, he received the news with inexpressible joy. He caused the cannon in the castle of San Angelo to be fired, commanded public rejoicings to celebrate the holy cause of the Church, and then published a jubilee throughout Europe, "in order," as he said, "that the Catholics might rejoice with their head at the magnificent holocaust offered to the papacy by the king of France." He received, with transports of ferocious joy, the head of the good Admiral Coligny, which the crowned murderess, Catherine, and her son, Charles, had sent him from Paris; and in return he sent them a magnificent "blessed sword," upon which he had caused to be engraved or etched the exterminating angel. He caused extravagant eulogiums of those deeds of butchery to be poured out in the churches of Naples, Florence, Venice, on the work that had

been done in France, and this was to incite other princes to take a course similar to that followed out by Catherine and Charles IX. Ecclesiastics nearly went into ecstacies over the complete success of the grand exploit. One priest, in his great hilarity over the blood that had been shed, cried out, from the depths of his soul, "Oh! admirable resolution! Oh! truly royal soul! Glory, eternal glory, to Charles IX., the greatest of kings, who did not recoil before the massacre of his subjects! May his name descend to posterity with the admiration it inspires in me; and may his example be followed by all the princes of the earth!"

Gregory was so desirous to perpetuate the memory of this bloody triumph that he called to him the most skillful painters and ordered from them several pictures, representing different episodes of the massacre. He also caused a bronze medal to be executed to commemorate the slaughtering of nearly one hundred thousand human beings. A detailed account of this Christian butchery will be found in the article on Catherine de Medici.

Space will not admit the recital of all the evil deeds which Gregory was guilty of. His attempts to enrich himself by appropriating the property of the murdered Huguenots must be passed over in silence. When Henry, duke of Anjou, a mixture of baseness, fanaticism, and cruelty, came into power by election, Gregory hastened to send a nuncio to him congratulating him upon his success and on the massacre of the heretics of Saucerre, presenting him at the same time with a vase of gold, in testimony of the high esteem in which he held him and to encourage him to show himself a worthy son of the Church by subduing its enemies. He entered into a compact with the family of the Guises to aid them in their plans of usurpation in case of the death of Charles IX., and, on this, they pledged themselves to do all in their power to make popery a triumph over heretics. These conditions being decided upon, the Jesuits at once received orders from their general to work under the direction of Cardinal Lorraine, "that debauchee of women" as Brantome calls him; "that

grand master of lewdness, who by legacies, flatteries, or promises, secured, ensnared, or debauched all the girls and women who came to court." Soon after the ratification of the compact Gregory caused to be preached in all the churches the necessity of a league and concerted action against the Protestants.

After the death of the miserable Charles IX., the duke of Anjou received the kingdom from the hands of his mother and was crowned as Henry III. The pope was not at all troubled by the change of rulers. He let the Guises manage matters and was engaged at organizing new massacres in other places to exterminate heretics. He furnished large sums of money to Philip II., for the express purpose of aiding him in his persecutions and butcheries against the heretics. He gave a hundred thousand ducats to the Archduke Charles for the same purpose; as many again to the knights of Malta, and seven thousands ducats to the duke of Brunswick, and all to promote the persecutions and murders of heretics. As his holiness was impatient to see the war rekindled between the Catholics and Protestants, he offered four hundred thousand crowns of gold to Henry III. if he would second the bloody views of the court of Rome. Henry took the money, but was too much occupied with his vile amours, orgies, and saturnalia to raise the bloody sword against the Protestants as the pope desired.

The pope, in seeking to create new defenders of the faith and new enemies to heretics, reëstablished the order of St. Basil, which had once counted five hundred monasteries in the kingdom of Naples alone. He founded twenty colleges or seminaries at Rome, governed by the Jesuits, who were under his jurisdiction, and who were destined for the English, Germans, Greeks, Maronites, Jews, Atheists, and repentants, and finally, he extended his operations into Bohemia, Moravia, Lithuania, Transylvania, etc. While he seemed to be working in the promotion of science and learning, his purpose was to rear up able combatants to overthrow the heretics, whom he always regarded as inveterate enemies.

Gregory turned with intense hatred towards Queen Elizabeth of England, and originated or participated in plots in connection with his intriguing Jesuits to cause her to be assassinated and the Protestant government of the British Isles overthrown. His emissaries entered England to carry out his purpose, but Elizabeth was on the alert, and the plots of Gregory and the Jesuits were nipped in the bud; some of the plotters were arrested, tried, and executed—Elizabeth thus proving herself fully a match for the intriguing pontiff at Rome.

The complicity of Gregory with the bloody Philip II. of Spain, and his plots and intrigues in France and Austria, will be passed over, but it is enough to say that plots and intrigues seemed to be his native element, and hatred of heretics and Protestants his most heartfelt devotion.

Among his evil deeds justice demands that he should be credited with some that were commendable. He did considerable to encourage science and schools of learning, and in this respect was far better than many of his predecessors. He conceded to the demands of the learned for a revision of the calendar. From bad calculations, errors so gross had crept into the computations of time that the festivals of the Church were inverted. Several popes, scandalized at seeing Easter come at the period fixed for the festival of the Trinity, had already endeavored, but in vain, to correct this error of calculation. Gregory had the good sense to call to his aid the learned of all nations, and then published under the superintendence of the celebrated doctor, Louis Lilion, the calendar now in use, and which has since been called the Gregorian. It was very soon adopted by all the Catholic States. It was, however, justly said by De Cormenin that "Gregory purchased this feeble service to the sciences by so much wickedness, that hatred was stronger than gratitude, and a concert of curses rose against him on every side."

His end, however, came at last, while he was preparing a bull of excommunication to hurl against the Huguenots of France. In April, 1585, he was struck with an attack of apoplexy, of which he died.

SIXTUS V.

Upon the death of Gregory XIII., Felix Peretti became pope. He had risen from a humble gardener's son and a swineherd to be a studious scholar, a doctor and professor, an inquisitor at Venice, to be a cardinal under the name of Montalto. He had long been ambitious to become pope, and had expressed his determination to sit in the papal chair. Knowing the incentive on the part of the cardinals to vote for a papal candidate who would not be likely to hold the position long, he for years simulated a feeble man who could only walk about with difficulty. After the death of Gregory he became, apparently, more feeble than ever, and he entered the conclave of forty-two cardinals for the purpose of electing a new pope, leaning upon a stick, and was so weak and exhausted that he asked for leave to retire to his chamber to rest a little and recuperate his waning strength. On the next day the intrigues usually attendant upon the election of a pope began, and the various candidates approached Cardinal Montalto to secure his aid in their several schemes; but he had a game worth two of theirs, and he excused himself upon the extremely weak condition he was in from taking any active part in their conflicting schemes, and from troubling himself about the cares of this world, and when one of the cardinals of the sacred college said to him in an ironical way, that he, Montalto, would be compelled to concern himself somewhat about the cares of this world, should he be proclaimed pope, he replied in a feeble voice, that his head bent towards the earth, and could never sustain the weight of a tiara, and that should such an honor be conferred upon so humble an individual as himself, he would be obliged to refuse it, or to lay the burden of the public business upon the sacred college.

There were fourteen candidates for the coveted chair; and in such a conflict, where almost every elector wished to be pope, it was difficult for them to play into each others hands. This was precisely what Montalto wished; he carefully guarded himself from showing any indications of ambition, or any desire of being chosen by the cardinals: on the contrary he pledged himself to serve every one, should they be the ones to receive the election. He did not leave his apartment save to go to mass to the Pauline Chapel or to assist at counting some of the votes. He worked shrewdly, however, to increase the dissensions, with the view that they would ultimately turn their attention upon him.

He succeeded in his craft. Some of the cardinals, becoming tired of the interminable caballing, abandoned their candidates in favor of Montalto on condition that he would surrender the government of the Church to them, which the wary cardinal agreed to do. Duped by his jugglery, and fearful that he should suddenly suffocate in a fit of coughing, and that his death should deprive them of the advantages he had promised them, they hastened to rally their partisans to secure the election of the crafty and hypocritical Montalto. He dragged himself by the aid of his cane into the Pauline chapel and voted like the rest: then, when the ballot was over, they proceeded to count the votes. Then took place a strange scene which no one expected, and which caused alarm in the conclave. As soon as Montalto discovered that he had received two-thirds of the votes he at once threw off his hypocritical disguise; he stood upright, and threw away his cane, and expectorated from as healthy a breast as was in the room. The cardinals were dumbfounded, and looked at each other anxiously. A question was raised as to whether the vote had been properly counted, whereupon Montalto shouted, "The thing is done and in due form." And the same man who, an hour before, could, to all appearances, scarcely speak aloud or walk, was able now to sing and thunder forth the Te Deum in a clear, sonorous voice. When one of the cardinals approached him and congratulated him upon his sudden

recovery, Montalto naïvely remarked, "I bent myself to seek on earth the keys of paradise; now that they are in my hands I can look God in the face." Cardinal Rusticucci, when he observed with what ease the new pope put on the pontifical ornaments and the little debility he exhibited, thus remarked: "Most holy Father, I see that the pontificate is a sovereign remedy to restore youth and health to old, sick cardinals." To which the holy Father replied: "I am as well persuaded of it as you are;" and when he had finished costuming himself he placed the tiara on his head and was enthroned by the name of Sixtus V.

The new pontiff, in token of his joyous advent, raised four scaffolds before his palace, and instead of granting an amnesty to criminals according to the custom usual at such elections, he caused sixty of the most obstinate heretics to be hung on the day of his coronation.

One incident will show the character of the man. After he had been installed on the pontifical throne, he brought his sister Camilla with her three children to Rome. She had been a laundress and now he made her a princess. The sudden transition was the subject of playful remarks at which he was piqued. He offered a thousand Roman crowns to him who would denounce the man who had made certain remarks about his sister. The guilty man himself obtained an audience of the pope, thinking to make a good speculation of it, and claimed the promised reward. "Count him out forty thousand pounds," said Sixtus, addressing his treasurer; and then turning towards the executioner, who was always near by, "and thou cut off his tongue and his right hand, for a fear of the repetition of the offense," and the cruel sentence was executed. A cold and implacable cruelty was a very prominent trait in the character of the man who now filled the chair of St. Peter. He announced of himself that, like Christ, he had come to bring a sword, not peace and "that he wished his reign to be renowned as among the most vigorous." Only a few of his acts of cruelty can be given here.

He deposed the judges who served under his predecessors,

because he fancied they had been too lenient to heretics. He issued most sanguinary edicts, which placed the lives of citizens at his mercy; among others, that every act of adultery should be punished with death. He imposed exhorbitant taxes and collected them with rigorous severity. He prohibited citizens from carrying arms, and punished severely those who dared disobey. He condemned a child of sixteen years to be hung for drawing a dagger upon a sbirri who had insulted him. The advocate for the youth pleaded for mercy on the ground of immature age, whereupon Sixtus imperiously remarked, "Well, by virtue of my omnipotence, I give him ten of my years. Let him be led to punishment."

He decided to use severe measures towards the Jesuits, whom he knew to be full of guile, fraud, intrigue, and base criminality; and this step was certainly not the worst one which he took during his reign. He appointed Cardinal Aldrobrandin president of a commission charged to inquire into the abuses which had been introduced into convents and monasteries everywhere. The commission was ordered to make a detailed report of the disorders found. The report made disclosed a horrible state of facts. The commissioners declared they could not find one monastery in which the inmates were not addicted to drunkenness, idleness, sodomy, and all kinds of abominations. They reported that in Austria they had visited one hundred and twenty-two convents of men and women, and that they had counted in the monasteries of the monks one hundred and ninety prostitutes, and fifty-five young boys and girls of less than twelve years of age; and in the houses of the nuns four hundred and forty-three male domestics, who were at once the servants and lovers of the sisterhood. They declared that in France the convents were theatres of still greater outrages. In Aurillac they found that the monks and the nuns abandoned themselves habitually to every species of depravity; that several monks had as high as five or six mistresses at once, either courtesans or young girls carried off from their parents, or women suborned or ravished from their husbands; that there

were, moreover, a large number of bastards, whom they also used as their minions. They proved, moreover, that the abbot, Charles de Senectaire, made sorties at the head of his monks, beat up the country to find maidens, and drove before him, in open day, with blows from his cross, such as suited him, forcing them to enter his den, without the fathers and mothers offering the least resistance, from fear of being assassinated by the monks.

He entered into the scheme to place Mary Stuart, queen of Scotland, on the throne of England in place of Elizabeth. He blessed the Spanish Armada which was to have demolished Great Britain. A Jesuit named Ballard was charged with the commission of undertaking the assassination of Queen Elizabeth. He employed a young man named Babington, a hasty, mercurial individual to perform the deed, but the plot was discovered, and Elizabeth refused to pardon either of the miscreants.

Sixtus played a villainous part in the Spanish-British affair. He urged on the campaign, and promised to pay one million crowns as soon as the Spaniards were in possession of a single city in England, and to give a cardinal's hat to the traitor Alleyn, who had sold himself to Spain. He issued a fearful bull of excommunication against Elizabeth, in which he said, "We declare, moreover, that foreigners or Englishmen are permitted as a meritorious work to seize the person of Elizabeth, and surrender her, living or dead, to the tribunals of the Inquisition. We promise to those who shall accomplish this glorious mission, infinite recompenses, not only in the life eternal, but even in this world. Finally, we grant plenary indulgences to the faithful who shall willingly unite with the Catholic army, which is going to combat the impious Elizabeth, under the orders of our dear son, Philip the Second, to whom we give the British Isles, in full sovereignty, as a recompense for the zeal he has always shown towards our see, and for the particular affection he has shown for the Catholics of the low countries."

The duplicity of the vile man can be appreciated when it

is understood that after issuing the above bull he held an interview with Carey, the representative of Elizabeth, to whom he made the greatest protestations of esteem for the queen, and enjoined Carey to write to her and advise her to place herself in a state of defense against the attacks of Philip. He also gave all the facts he knew about the condition of Philip's army. After the disastrous shipwreck of the Invincible Armada and the return in disgrace to Spain of the few ships that escaped destruction, Sixtus, especially to Carey, pretended to be overjoyed. His conduct in this direction was supposed to be influenced by the beautiful Anne Austin, a charming young English woman who had accompanied Carey, and who visited Sixtus almost daily—when he did not visit her privately—and acted the part of a mistress towards him. She swayed a great influence over the pope.

It is not the purpose here to enter into a full detail of all the intrigues, heartlessness, and hypocrisy of which Sixtus was guilty. Enough has been given to show the character of the man.

On the twenty-seventh of August, 1590, Sixtus, after a wicked reign of nearly five years and a half, died from the effects of poison, administered as it was believed by the Jesuits. He had shown a decided unfriendliness towards their order, and their hatred to him was deep and deadly. His life was the forfeit.

Leti, the Catholic biographer of Sixtus, maintains the purity and holiness of his favorite in his sacerdotal functions, but admits that "in his capacity of sovereign he was obliged to use bad faith and duplicity, and to employ intrigue and treason and even commit crimes to make his designs successful." How a man as sovereign can be guilty of duplicity, intrigues, treason, and other crimes, and in the character of holy Father be pure, saintly, and spotless is not easy for all to comprehend, though to Leti it seemed perfectly easy.

De Cormenin, in closing his sketch of this corrupt vicegerent, says: "Sixtus had not, in fact, recoiled before any

means to restore to the papacy its former splendor. He had armed kings against each other, and during the terrible combats he had excited, he hovered over Europe, from the heights of Rome, ready to pounce upon the vanquished, like crows upon the dead bodies at the close of a battle. His rapacity and cruelty had excited such a hatred against him, that on the day of his death a revolution broke out in the holy city; the people ran to arms, broke the statues of the tyrant drove off his satellites, and went to besiege the Vatican to seize the dead body and cast it into the Tiber."

This man was another of the moral monsters who, under the rule of a false and tyrannous system of religion, played the part of a heartless, cruel, unprincipled despot, who cared nothing for the happiness or welfare of the masses below him, but sought only his own power and aggrandizement, and to destroy every vestige of mental liberty in the minds of those he ruled over. He was one of those religious tyrants who were only a curse to mankind.

JAMES I.

When Elizabeth of England was dying, her attendant courtiers asked who should be her successor. She replied that her seat had been the seat of kings, and that she would have succeed her "No rascal's son, but a king's." This answer not being exactly clear to the staring lords, they took the liberty of asking whom she meant. "Whom should I mean but our cousin of Scotland?" replied Elizabeth. Again they asked her, after she had become speechless, whether she was still in the same mind. The only answer she could then give was to struggle up in bed, and join her hands over her head in the form of a crown.

This "cousin of Scotland" was the son of her murdered rival, Mary, Queen of Scots. Soon after Mary's accession to the Scottish crown, Elizabeth had sent over to Holyrood palace Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, to win the hand of the beautiful young queen.

Darnley succeeded in gaining the heart of Mary, and marrying her, with the help of one of her secretaries, who had great influence over her, named David Rizzio.

Mary had been married but a little while when she began to hate her husband, who, it appears was a vain, vicious, and simple sort of a fellow. Then Darnley became so jealous of Rizzio that he set about putting him out of the way; and on Saturday night, the ninth of March, 1566, Darnley led a gang of assassins up a dark private staircase to a room where Mary, her sister, Lady Argyle, and the doomed David were sitting at supper. Darnley seized the queen around the waist, while the murderers dragged David from the apartment and dispatched him with fifty-six stabs. When he was dead, Mary said, "No more tears. I will now think of revenge!"

She soon afterwards, while her heart was still raging with revenge, gave birth to the subject of this sketch. It is the province of the psychologist to conjecture what influence this circumstance may have had on the career and character of James I.

At the christening of the young prince, Elizabeth was his godmother, though not present on the occasion. A week afterwards Darnley was taken sick with the small-pox at his father's house in Glasgow. Mary had him removed to Edinburgh, to a lone house outside the city called the Kirk of Field. One Sunday night not long afterwards the city was shaken by a great explosion, and the Kirk of Field was blown to atoms. The next day Darnley's body was found at a distance under a tree. This was unqestionably the revenge that Mary had threatened.

Upon her compulsory abdication, her son, not then aged two years, was crowned James VI. of Scotland. The earlier years of his reign were spent under the care of the successive regents, who were either appointed by the Scottish parliament or obtained the office by conspiracy and insurrection. When he attained his majority he gave himself up to favorites, who flattered his vanity, appealed to his timidity, and ruled as they listed. Elizabeth contrived to obtain such influence over him that he very tamely submitted to his mother's long captivity and unjust execution. He was frequently conspired against by his nobles, and was held in great suspicion by the Presbyterians for his predilections in favor of prelacy. He was a descendant of Henry VII., and in a few hours after Elizabeth's death was proclaimed king of England by the title of James I.

Having been brought up in the stern and simple worship of the Scotch, his accession was hailed with the highest satisfaction by the Protestant portion of the kingdom. And so he came to the English throne with the greatest ease.

He was a month on the road from Edinburgh to London. He hanged a pickpocket without trial, and knighted everybody who fell in his way on the journey. He made two hun-

dred knights before he reached London, and seven hundred immediately after. The next thing he did was to send sixty-two new peers into the House of Lords, the most of whom were Scotchmen.

He is described by Charles Dickens as "ugly, awkward, and shuffling, both in mind and person. His tongue was too large for his mouth, his legs were too weak for his body, and his dull goggle-eyes stared and rolled like an idiot's. He was cunning, covetous, wasteful, idle, drunken, greedy, dirty, cowardly, a great swearer, and the most conceited man on earth. His figure—what is commonly called rickety from his birth—presented a most ridiculous appearance, dressed in thick-padded clothes, as a safeguard against being stabbed (of which he lived in continual fear), of grass-green color from head to foot, with a hunting-horn dangling at his side instead of a sword, and his hat and feather sticking over one eye, or hanging on the back of his head, as he happened to toss it on. He used to loll on the necks of his favorite courtiers, and slobber their faces, and kiss and pinch their cheeks; and the greatest favorite he ever had used to sign himself, in his letters to his royal master, his majesty's 'dog and slave,' and used to address his majesty as 'his Sowship.' His majesty was the worst rider ever seen, and thought himself the best. He was one of the most impertinent talkers (in the broadest Scotch) ever heard, and boasted of being unanswerable in all manner of argument. He wrote some of the most wearisome treatises ever read—among others, a book upon witchcraft, in which he was a devout believer—and thought himself a prodigy of authorship. He thought and wrote and said that a king had a right to make and unmake what laws he pleased, and ought to be accountable to nobody on earth. This is the plain, true character of the personage whom the greatest men about the court praised and flattered to that degree that I doubt if there be anything much more shameful in the annals of human nature."

James had a mighty high opinion of his religious notions. He was bound that his form of the Protestant faith should

prevail throughout the kingdom, and that everybody should adopt it, whether they liked it or not. And so he proceeded to establish one high and convenient form of religion to which everybody was bound to belong. Of course "his Sowship," as his favorite, "Steenie," used to call him, could not carry this out without having trouble with his Catholic subjects. Jesuits and priests and some Puritan noblemen began to plot against him.

Lord Cobham, a miserable creature of James, charged the great Sir Walter Raleigh with being implicated in one of these plots, the pretended object of which was the placing of the Lady Arabella Stuart, a daughter of the younger brother of James' father, upon the throne. Raleigh was arraigned for treason. His trial lasted from eight o'clock in the morning till midnight. It is said that he defended himself with a genius, eloquence, and spirit that was wonderful. But nevertheless he was sentenced to death, and was taken to the Tower. His execution was deferred. It was deferred for twelve long years, during which time he was shut up a close prisoner in the Tower. James' son and heir to the throne, the young Prince Henry, declared that nobody but his father could keep such a bird in such a cage. It was for this young prince that Raleigh wrote, while languishing in the terrible Tower, the beginning of a "History of the World." The mightiest monarch that ever sat on England's throne could do but little to confine the mind of such a man, however long he might imprison his body.

James had an avaricious eagerness to get gold. At last Raleigh proposed to resume his old sea voyages, and go and get gold for him. So he set him free after taking sufficient securities for his return. Sir Walter fitted out an expedition at his own cost, and on the twenty-eighth of March, 1617, sailed away in command of one of its ships, called the Destiny, for South America. The expedition failed. He did not find the gold, and his men mutinied. A quarrel broke out between him and the Spaniards, who hated him for his old successes against them. He took a little town called St. Thomas and burnt it.

He came back to England broken-hearted, with his hopes and fortunes shattered. He was denounced as a traitor by the Spanish embassador, and was again taken and immured in his prison-home in the Tower. He was condemned to death under his former sentence, then fifteen years old. On the twenty-ninth of October, 1618, at eight o'clock in the morning, after a cheerful breakfast, a pipe, and a cup of good wine, he was taken to the scaffold in the Old Palace Yard, in Westminster. He behaved nobly. It was a very cold morning, and the executioner asked him if he would not come down to the fire and warm himself. Raleigh thanked him, and said he had rather die at once; for he was ill with fever and ague, and in a short time his shaking fit would come upon him if he were alive, and his enemies might say that he trembled for fear. After kneeling and making a beautiful prayer, he rose and felt the edge of the axe, observing that it was a sharp medicine, but one which would cure the worst disease. Then he laid his head upon the block, and seeing the executioner hesitate, he said to him, "What dost thou fear? Strike, man!" Then he struck the blow, and the head of Sir Walter Raleigh rolled off, in the sixty-sixth year of his age.

In the early part of James' reign, there were two orders of priests who were very busy in England, and who were much dreaded. These were the Jesuits and the seminary priests. The people had a great horror of the first, because they taught that murder was lawful if it were done for the good of the order; and they had a great horror of the second because they were the successors of "Queen Mary's priests." The severest laws were enacted against them, and were most unmercifully executed. Those who sheltered them in their houses often suffered severely for what was an act of humanity; and the rack, that cruel instrument of torture which tore people's limbs asunder, was kept in constant use.

The people still lived under the dread of the Catholic religion. The horrors of Mary's time were still fresh in their recollection. And they had good reason for fearing the plots

of the Jesuits. The massacre of St. Bartholomew was not forgotten. The great Protestant hero, William, the prince of Orange, was shot by an assassin, who confessed that he had been kept and trained for the purpose in a Jesuit college. Parliament revived and strengthened the severe laws against the old religion. And this led a desperate Catholic gentleman of an old family, named Robert Catesby, to form one of the most terrible designs ever conceived in the mind of man. This is what is popularly known as the Gunpowder Plot. The object of this scheme was to blow up the king, lords, and commons, when they assembled at the opening of parliament, with a great mine of gunpowder. His confidant in this horrid project was one Thomas Winter, a Worcestershire gentleman who had served in the army abroad, and who had already been engaged in several Jesuitical plots. While on a mission to the Spanish embassador in the Netherlands, he had met at Ostend a tall, dark, daring man, whom he had known when they were both soldiers abroad, by the name of Guy Fawkes. Knowing this man to be ready for any desperate deed, Winter proposed the plot to him.

The two came back to England together. Here they picked up two other conspirators, Thomas Percy and John Wright, his brother-in-law. They met together and took the oath of secrecy in a solitary house, then in the open fields near London, but now a compact part of the great city. Father Gerard, a Jesuit priest, administered to them the sacrament. Percy hired a house, the back of which joined the House of Parliament. The conspirators hired another house on the Lambeth side of the Thames for the purpose of storing wood, gunpowder, and other combustible materials. These were removed, small quantities at a time, to the house adjoining the parliament house. They laid in a good stock of eatables, and began to dig under the great wall that separated the buildings. Needing additional help, they took into their plot Christopher Wright, a younger brother of John Wright. The work was severe, and they dug day and night. But parliament was suddenly prorogued, and the conspirators separ-

ated for a time. Early in February, 1605, Catesby and the conspirators again came together to carry their terrible plot into execution. They now admitted three others into their secret. The digging was again resumed, Fawkes prowling about as sentinel. It was a tremendously thick wall, and the work progressed slowly. Suddenly their plans were changed. They found that the coal dealer who had occupied the cellar under the parliament house had removed his stock. They at once hired the cellar, put thirty-six barrels of gunpowder in it, and covered them with fagots and coal.

Several rich gentlemen were taken into the conspiracy. Horses were secured in readiness to ride through the country and rouse the Catholics after the parliament should be blown into the air. A ship was kept in the Thames to take Fawkes to Flanders after firing the fatal train. Parliament was to meet on the fifth of November. The conspirators had everything in readiness. Francis Tresham, of Northamptonshire, had been taken into the plot. Lord Mounteagle, his brother-in-law, was certain to be in the house. Unable to devise any other way of sparing his relative, Tresham wrote him a mysterious letter. It contained these words: "That the parliament should receive a terrible blow, and yet should not see who hurt them." And it added, "The danger is past, as soon as you have burnt the letter."

Now, it will be remembered that James' father, Darnley, had been the victim of a gunpowder plot. James was the first to sense the significance of this letter. It was decided to let the conspirators alone until the very day before the opening of parliament. The conspirators had their fears Tresham told his companions that they were all dead men. There is reason to suppose that he warned others besides Lord Mounteagle. But every one remained firm; none took flight. Fawkes continued to keep watch in the cellar. On the fourth of November, 1605, he was there as usual, when about two o'clock in the afternoon the lord chamberlain and Mounteagle threw open the door and looked in. "Who are you, friend?" said they. "Why," said Fawkes, "I am Mr.

Percy's servant, and am looking after his store of fuel here." "Your master has laid in a pretty good store," they replied, and went away.

Upon this Fawkes posted off to tell the other conspirators all was quiet, and again went back to the dark cellar. He heard the great bell strike twelve o'clock, that ushered in the fifth of November, and two hours afterwards he cautiously came out of the cellar in his old prowling way to look about him. He was instantly seized and bound by a party of soldiers under Sir Thomas Knevett. He had a watch upon him, some touchwood, some tinder, and slow-matches. A dark-lantern with a lighted candle in it was found behind the door. The soldiers took Fawkes to the king's bed-chamber. In reply to James' question, how he could have the heart to destroy so many innocent people, Fawkes replied, "Because desperate diseases need desperate remedies." When asked why he had collected so much gunpowder, he answered, "To blow Scotchmen back to Scotland, and it would take a deal of powder to do it."

The conspirators were taken to the tower and put to the torture. One of them, named Bates, said the Jesuits had to do with the plot. The trial of Fawkes and his companions came on the fifteenth of January. They were all found guilty, hanged, drawn, and quartered, some on the top of Ludgate Hill, some before the parliament house. A Jesuit priest, named Henry Garnet, was found guilty, out of his own mouth, and executed. The Catholic Church made a saint of him. Such, briefly stated, are the most essential facts in the famous Gunpowder Plot.

During the reign of James in Scotland the ecclesiastical affairs of the kingdom were under the control of the Church. Neither by force nor artifice could the king bring the clergy to do as they were bid. He had a world of trouble with the Northern ministers. He had let loose in his own capital large bodies of licensed banditti, who, by threatening to plunder the city, should oblige the refractory churchmen to agree to whatever terms he might dictate. But he never succeeded in

reducing the Scotch Kirk under his subjection. The Church was the guardian of the liberties of Scotland. After James became king of England he determined to employ the resources of his new kingdom to curb his old one and deal a deadly blow at the independence of the Scotch Church. He prorogued their assemblies. The Presbyteries took upon themselves to convene others. He arrested fourteen of the clergy and committed them to prison. Six of them were convicted of high treason. After a term of close imprisonment they were condemned to perpetual exile. The clergy were imprisoned or forced to fly. Terror and proscription prevailed all over Scotland. James succeeded in entirely subjugating the liberties of his native country.

As every one knows, it was during the reign of James that a new translation of the whole Bible was made, which has been the one in general use ever since. For this purpose he selected fifty-four persons who knew a great deal about old dead languages and the technicalities of inspiration to put the books of the Bible into plain English. In the year 1607, forty-seven of these persons, seven having died, assembled together and arranged themselves into committees. They were furnished with the best translations, and various versions of the original text, and set to work. After three years of assiduous labor they severally completed the parts assigned them; they met together, and fixed up the word of God just as it ought to be. This translation was published in 1610, and given to the world by public authority. Full as it is with errors and glaring mistranslations, it has answered the purpose of the various Protestant denominations, ever since. This single circumstance has served to invest the reign of his "Sowship" with a sort of sanctity to Bible-worshipers.

The remaining fifteen years of James' gluttonous life are without particular interest to the readers of this volume. Sunday, the twenty-seventh of March, 1625, he died, after a fortnight's illness. He had reigned twenty-two years, and was fifty-nine years old.

In the following few words Macaulay sums up the charac-

ter of James: "His cowardice, his childishness, his pedantry, his ungainly person and manners, his provincial accent made him an object of derision. Even in his virtues and accomplishments there was something eminently unkingly. Throughout the whole course of his reign, all the venerable associations by which the throne had long been fenced were gradually losing their strength. During two hundred years all the sovereigns who had ruled England, with the single exception of the unfortunate Henry VI., had been strong-minded, high-spirited, courageous, and of princely bearing. Almost all had possessed abilities above the ordinary level. It was no light thing that, on the very eve of the decisive struggle between our kings and their parliaments, royalty should be exhibited to the world stammering, slobbering, shedding unmanly tears, trembling at a drawn sword, and talking in the style alternately of a buffoon and of a pedagogue." The following will show the estimation in which he was held by Charles Dickens: "I know of nothing more abominable in history than the adulation that was lavished on this king, and the vice and corruption that such a barefaced habit of lying produced in his court. It is much to be doubted whether one man of honor, and not utterly self-disgraced, kept his place near James I. Lord Bacon, that able and wise philosopher, as the first judge in the kingdom in this reign, became a public spectacle of dishonesty and corruption; and in his base flattery of his Sowship, and in his crawling servility to his dog and slave, disgraced himself even more. But a creature like his Sowship set upon a throne is like a plague, and everybody receives infection from him."

PAUL V.

Camillus Borghese, who ascended the papal throne in 1605, under the title of Paul V., was a Roman by birth, and had been educated for the law. Seeing that piety paid better than pleading at the bar, he gave up his legal profession and entered upon an ecclesiastical career. His promotion in the Church was rapid, and he obtained successively the profitable positions of vice-legate of Bologna, auditor of the chamber, vicar of the pope, grand inquisitor, and, finally, cardinal.

True to the traditional policy of the popes, he immediately distributed all the offices and dignities of the Church among his relatives, thereby laying the foundation for the enormous wealth which has since made famous the Borghese family of Italy. Paul undertook to bring all the States of Italy under his control, but Venice successfully resisted his efforts. Falling back upon his spiritual armory, he excommunicated the Venetians, but even this failed to bring them to terms. They not only defied his thunderbolts but expelled the Jesuits from their territory. Fearful that he would lose all power over the brave Venetians, spiritual as well as temporal, Paul finally concluded a treaty of peace with them and turned his attention to England.

He ordered the English Catholics to refuse to obey the king. The result of his intrigues in England, together with the efforts of the Jesuits, was the celebrated and diabolical Gunpowder Plot, details of which are given elsewhere.

As the principal events of importance which occurred during the reign of this pontiff are given in other parts of this

volume, only some of the affairs in which he was personally concerned will be mentioned here.

The celebrated author, Dominis, having written a work, "The Ecclesiastical Republic," which displeased the pope, orders were given to the faculty of theology in France for its suppression, and Paul offered to make a cardinal of the author if he would come to Rome, rewrite the book, retracting the offensive passages, and publish it under the immediate supervision of the pope. Dominis, enticed by the tempting offer, ventured to Rome to secure the promised reward: but once in the power of Paul, he was seized, thrown into a dungeon in the castle of San Angelo, and poisoned, after an imprisonment of five days. For the edification of the faithful and as a warning to heretical writers, the pope then caused the body of the unfortunate Dominis, to be publicly burnt, along with his books, in the square of Flora.

The college of cardinals during the pontificate of Paul was a conglomeration of rascals, robbers, voluptuaries, and sodomites, fit satellites for such an infamous pope. There was no pretense of decency or shame at the Vatican. Among the wretches elevated to the cardinalate by Paul was one who had been the keeper of a brothel, and he did not give up his occupation when he became a prince of the Church. Another of the cardinals made by Paul was chief of a band of robbers, and he was made cardinal in order to secure the valuable services of his bandits in the secret service of the Church.

The celebrated theologian, Nicholas de Marbais, a contemporary of Paul V., gives a startling picture of the infamous abominations practiced at the court of this model vicegerent of the gentle Jesus. He says: "In that accursed court, the princes of the Church freely abandoned themselves to all sorts of abominations with their Ganymedes. They did not fear in the face of day to ravish children and carry off young girls for their voluptuous saloons. All knew that there was neither justice nor shame at the Vatican; they therefore took no pains to conceal their turpitudes. Prelates, as well as mere clergymen, went in open day, dressed in their camailas

to the houses of women of pleasure, and caused the husbands or the fathers of the women or girls whom they had carried off to be assassinated publicly.

"Paul V. laughs at all this dissoluteness, and wallows like a hog in the most stinking and disgusting odors of adultery and sodomy that can be imagined. And should he not applaud the murder of a husband or a father, who himself poisoned the wife of one of his brothers because she refused his infamous caresses? Should he not glory in incests, who himself had bastards by his own sister, and who is the father of the cardinal nephew? Who, O my God, will dare to recount the abominations which have procured for the wife of the second brother of his holiness the name of popess, which is publicly given to her at Rome; by what shameful means has she become the dispensress of bishoprics, cardinals' hats, and all the benefices; how is it that this new Joan governs the Church, seated on the throne of the apostle, the tiara on her brow, and the keys of heaven in her hands, stained with licentiousness? Who shall dare to say that the pontiff, the supreme head of Christendom, the vicar of God on earth, has in the Cardinal Borghese at once a nephew, a son, and a minion?"

On the twenty-eighth of January, 1621, after a reign of sixteen years, Paul V. died from an attack of apoplexy.

PERSECUTIONS OF WITCHES.

Witchcraft is a sad variety of epidemic mental delusions that have existed in many countries and in various periods of time. It was known in pagan nations; the Jews had their witches and believed in them; but Christianity has furnished the most prolific soil for this mental malady, and it has abounded as much among Protestants as Catholics. It has always flourished best among the ignorant, superstitious, and degraded, but in many instances the more enlightened and better classes have not been free from its dire effects. A belief in a devil has been a prime necessity to its success: for in all times it has been believed to be the work of his Satanic majesty, who, it was thought, resorted to every vile use of his power possible, and transmitted the same to those bewitched, to set aside nature's laws and perform the most fantastic and impossible tricks the mind could possibly imagine. If any calamity happened, if a storm spread over the country, if a fire raged, if the crops were cut short by frost or blight, if the cattle became infected with disease, if people fell a prey to fevers, malaria, or any contagious diseases, it was believed to be the work of the devil in the form of witches. In thousands of instances where these things have occurred, some poor woman, old or young, as the case might be, has been judged to be the immediate cause of the calamity; and by the most severe punishment innocent women have been made to confess themselves guilty of producing storms, tornadoes, local famine, sickness, and all the evils in the catalogue. Everything which deviated from the ordinary course of events was set down as witchery or sorcery. Intercourse with the devil and evil spirits was believed in to

that extent that it became a rage, a hallucination, a mental disease.

Persons accused of witchcraft have been subjected to the most cruel persecutions. Torture and death in all the forms that the ingenuity of man could devise have been resorted to to punish the poor wretches who were adjudged guilty of holding communion with the devil or of receiving his power and influence from any one bewitched. The history of witchcraft has been a sad one, indeed—one of the darkest and bloodiest pages in the entire history of the world and of the actions of men; and it has all been done in the name of God, religion, and morality. The command given in what has been so widely believed to be God's word—"Suffer no witch to live"—has been the excuse for the most terrible persecutions and death of countless thousands of most unfortunate men, women, and children. That command, which was implicitly believed to have emanated from a God of mercy and love, has been the cause and apology for more human misery and suffering than is possible to be conceived of. Sad, indeed, was it for the human race when that bloody edict was written and accepted as the injunction of the Universal Father. Both sexes, and even children, have been made the recipients of these cruel persecutions; but females have been by far the greatest sufferers. They have been the imaginary witches, and they have been compelled to pay the penalty in blood and death.

It was believed that persons of learning and scientific attainments were in league with the devil and witches, and the greatest obloquy and inconvenience have been brought upon them in consequence. In the thirteenth century, Roger Bacon, a man of remarkable powers of mind and scholarly attainments in the sciences of optics, chemistry, and astronomy, was accused of being in compact with the devil, and upon him was visited a papal denunciation and two long and painful imprisonments.

In 1305 Arnold de Villa Nova, a learned physician and philosopher, eighty years of age, was burned at Padua, by

order of inquisitors, on the charge of witchcraft. Ten years afterwards, Peter Apon, also of Padua, a man who had made great progress in learning, was accused and tried for witchcraft, and condemned to death, but he died before the day of execution.

A young girl belonging to the Texerants in the neighborhood of Trier, which country was especially notorious for sorcery, was burnt in the fourteenth century, though her witch-instructress and reckless seducer escaped by means of a piece of twine, out of the window. Old women were now particularly the objects of suspicion, because they would not confess that they occasionally appeared as toads, or that they had witnessed such transformations; for toads were regarded as disguised demons in the arena of witchcraft. The devil now appeared, it was believed, amongst the male heretics in the form of tom-cats and he-goats; amongst the women as toads and geese, and finally as cats. Gregory IX. wrote to Prince Henry, the son of the Emperor Frederick, of toads and geese as "the outwardly evil shapes, because the inner person was overcome by Jesus Christ."

After many witches and three wizards had been burnt at Trier, the burning, according to Semler, spread extensively in those countries, quite to the Rhine, so that at length earnest complaints were made in Mainz that many totally innocent people had been burnt because they would not confess that they occasionally were toads; and a man by the name of Ausfried confessed that he had himself put many persons to death for that reason alone.

Towards the end of the thirteenth century many books on witchcraft had already been brought out, and in various languages, especially in the Netherlands and in Germany, the essential contents of which consisted in the art of expelling the devil. By this means the fear of the devil, superstition, and belief in witches became universal.

Raynald, in speaking of the great prevalence and diffusion of witchcraft, said: "In Germany and Italy especially, such numbers of men were seduced to sorcery that the whole earth

was overflowed by it, and would have been laid waste by the devil had they not in both countries burnt some thirty thousand heretics."

From this time forward heresy and witchcraft were placed in the same category. Seeing or having a vision of the devil was deemed the same as having intercourse with him, and equally falling from the faith. Any deviation from the orthodox faith was sufficient to class a person amongst the heretics, as the Albigenses, the Waldenses, the Stedingses, the Manicheans, etc., under which all varieties of opinions were placed. To these belong the persecutions of the Templars, and their judicial arraignment, which effected the annihilation of that once celebrated order. Among the accusations brought against the accused of this class were prominently these two: 1. The denial of God and of Christ; 2. The worship of the devil, or sorcery. Without the fact having been proved, it was taken for granted against the Templars that they were enemies of God; and it was then argued that their external Christianity was blasphemous hypocrisy, and that they worshiped the devil in the shape of a black cat, like their followers, the Manicheans, Stedingses, etc. Against these last Gregory IX. had already, as against heretics, deists, and sorcerers, issued an edict in 1232" (Henke's Magazine).

In 1484 Pope Innocent VIII. issued a bull encouraging and requiring the arrest and punishment of persons suspected of witchcraft. From this moment the prosecutions became frequent and the victims numerous in many of the countries of Europe, and the more the persecutions were imposed the more the number of the victims increased. The more the attention was called to the subject of witches the more sensitive and sympathetic females became subjects of the popular delusion or epidemic.

After this period it was established by law that witches were heretics, and that they were both in the direct service of the devil. An accusation made out of suspicion or enmity was held to be sufficient impeachment, and was followed by

the criminal trial and the trial by the fire-death. It mattered not whether the accused confessed or not. In the first case he was guilty; in the second he was punished as a hardened sinner; and this cruel intolerance ruled from the magnates of the Church through the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. All countries, all conditions, all intellects were entangled in an indescribable manner in the logic of the devil, possessed with his fear, and driven to counsel and action by frenzy and fatuity, by policy and thirst for vengeance, till the social abode of the earth was converted into an actual hell.

The witchcraft bull of Innocent VIII. was in this wise: The pope expressed his grief that in many parts of Germany, many persons of both sexes, forgetful of their salvation, and falling away from the Catholic faith, mingle themselves with demons and paramour devils, and then by their aid and magical means use devilish arts to torment men and animals, effect unspeakably numerous evils, and destroy the fruits of the earth, as vineyards, gardens, and meadows, disastrously affect both men and women, and perpetrate incalculable crimes. The pope, by virtue of this bull, conferred power on three appointed preachers, to expound the word of God in those countries to the faithful, to hunt out the heretics, and to punish them by excommunication, censure, and chastisement, by interdict and suspension, and even to hang them, without any power of appeal. He commanded the bishop of Strasburg, not by any means, either of himself or by others, to make known publicly to the accused, the charge against him; he was not allowed to weaken or restrict the power of the said apostolic letters by any means whatsoever; nor to contradict nor resist the orders of the commissioners, let the rank, office privileges, nobility, or consideration of the accused be whatsoever they might.

Through this ordinance the inquisitors had an easy game of it, for no one dared to contradict their opinion. Thus there could be no contradiction; every objection which necessity and justice, sagacity and truth, might advocate, was

beaten down beforehand; and there could be no appeal whatever to any higher tribunal. General as the belief in witches then was, there were people enough who saw deeper, who had understanding and feeling enough to deny the benefit of such nonsense, and to deplore the misery and the horrors which must thus be poured upon mankind. The witch prosecutions had not been formally recognized; and the judge might be summoned to a higher tribunal to answer for his judgment; but by this bull of Innocent's heresy and sorcery were linked together. "He who believes otherwise is a sorcerer, and he who is bewitched is a heretic, or a confederate of the devil," was the belief that was promulgated.

Through this change of authority a terrible innovation was made, and the secular power was placed in subjection to that of the inquisitors. It is not strange that this bull was regarded by the sensible people of all conditions, even by clergymen and preachers, with the most decided repugnance; and some of them had the intelligence and independence to declare that there were no such things as witches, and that they had no arts by which they could injure men or animals; by which imprudent language the secular arm was not unfrequently restrained from punishing such sorceries; and thus they became amazingly increased, and heresy became enormously strengthened. The work on witchcraft, entitled the "Witch-Hammer," contained much matter queer and interesting. The fourteenth chapter explained how the witches bewitched cows. According to Sprenger, the witch-milking process took place in this way: "The witch sticks a knife into a wall, takes a milk pail between the knees, and cries to the devil to send the milk of the cow that belongs to this or that person. The devil immediately milks the cow, and brings the milk to the witch, when it appears to run out of the knife handle, by which the devil only deceives the witch, for he has brought the milk through the air. In a similar manner the witches supplied themselves with butter, out of water that flowed by, and especially good May-butter; and the devil steals for them the wine of pious people from their

cellars. Cattle are bewitched by the touch, and even by looking at them. They make for such purposes all kinds of magical instruments, pictures, especially of toads, lizards, snakes, etc., and lay them under the door-sills, and thereby they spoil milk and produce diseases in the cattle."

The fifteenth chapter treats of witch thunder storms and damages to cattle and corn. As on one occasion terrible tempests laid waste the country from Ravensburg to Salzburg, the people cried out loudly against the witches who had occasioned it. "We caused, therefore," said Sprenger, "a few notorious old women to be arrested and tortured; and the event showed that we had hit on the chief offenders, for they all confessed." They were burnt, as a matter of course. In the sixteenth chapter the witchery of men is described, and consisted of two principal kinds: shooting with bows, the devil directing the arrows, so they would be sure to hit; the enchanting of swords, so as to sharpen those of friends and dull those of enemies, for which purpose they used magic songs, spells, and witch-knots. To the great trouble, however, of the wizards, such men were very frequently taken under the protection of powerful nobles. The "Witch-Hammer" consists of three parts, with from sixteen to twenty chapters in each part. Full directions were given how to detect the different grades of witchcraft and the manner in which torture and punishment should be applied in the witch trials.

The witch prosecutions were terribly relentless and severe. It would take a long history to give them all, and a mention of a few only must suffice. The prosecutions at Arras, in France, in 1459, were of a very superstitious and terrible character. Demoniac assemblies of paramour devils of both sexes were proved. The proceedings of these assemblies—whither the witches were suddenly transported in the night—exceeded anything that was ever conceived by superstitious men of the grossest sensuality and depraved imagination. The trials at Mora were not behind in cruelty, and exceeded in its proof of the universal belief in sorcery, of the folly of women in declaring it, and of a contagious and, as it were,

general prevailing perversion of mind, for even children were summoned on the trials. Many children were affected simultaneously with the women with cramps and faintings, in which they passed to the witch-dances and to the witch-assemblies on the Blacksberg.

These were a universal terror in Sweden, and the king sent a commission to Mora, where the inquisitors, by means of the rack, soon procured evidence enough; and seventy-two women, with fifteen children, were condemned to death, and many others to severe punishments. Nearly all the condemned victims confessed the most absurd nonsense as to their intercourse with the devil in all sorts of shapes and clothes; that they had lived and feasted with him; had been married to him; and that he had even allowed a priest to baptize them.

At the arrest and trial of the witches in the city of Arras the victims were so tortured and horribly racked that many confessed that they had had personal interviews with the devil; that they had met him in conclave with numerous persons; that the devil had given feasts and treated his guests with wine and many fine dishes, and that all present had made merry. They confessed that in the assemblage were persons of distinction, and their being thus implicated was sufficient provocation for their arrest and torture. They averred, too, that the devil gave a sum of money to every person at his witch assemblies. Some of the rich and powerful were able to purchase security, but large numbers were racked in the most cruel manner and tortured to death, while others were burnt at the stake. Some endured the agonies of torture with wonderful patience, and would confess nothing. Some gave large sums of money to the judges and tormenters, while others again, with the hope of escaping the cruel punishment, confessed to all the crimes laid to their charge. Still others fled the country and were able to make their escape. Some of the judges were so abominably base that they caused numerous people, whom they knew to be perfectly innocent, but against whom they entertained evil designs, to be accused

of gathering at these nocturnal witch assemblies and worshiping the devil in the shape of tom-cats, he-goats, etc., at the close of which saturnalia the most lewd practices were indulged in. Many unfortunate girls were tortured till they confessed having fallen in love with the devil and of having cohabited with him in the form of he-goats, etc., and that the progeny was lizards, snakes, toads, etc.

The well known trial of Joan of Arc, or the Maid of Orleans, at Rouen, in 1434, was a sad one. She had been a quiet, pious, herd-maiden, who subsequently had, with remarkable heroism, displayed wonderful valor in helping to free France from its deadly foes. She was at length taken prisoner by her enemies, and tried as a witch, on the ground that she could not have performed the brave deeds she did except through witchcraft. The accusation was admitted by those who ought to have been her friends, and the Inquisition summoned her before its tribunals, and, spite of the want of a single trace of guilt, she was condemned to death.

It is well known that King James I. of England, that staunch defender of Protestantism, under whose auspices the present received version of the Jewish Scriptures were translated, wrote a somewhat elaborate work on witchcraft and demonology, which in many respects corresponded with the noted "Witch-Hammer." He fully believed in the existence of witches, and that they depended upon the influence and power of the devil. He laid down ordinances and laws for the trial of sorcerers and witches, and during much of his reign the courts were kept pretty busy in trying witches and sorcerers. The workings and intrigues of the devil took more of their attention than almost any other subject.

The following quotation gives, perhaps, one of the most complete descriptions of the proceedings at the witch assemblies: "The devil appears as a handsome young man, wearing feathers, and amorously disposed. When it is too late, the witches first perceive, the horsefoot or the goosefoot. He then compels them to renounce God; baptizes them, and gives them a new name, at the same time that he conceals his

own. Sometimes he approaches as a mouse, crow, or fly, but soon assumes the human form. After repeated intercourse with him the witches only receive small presents of money which, in fact, are only disguised filth. He appoints certain days on which they shall visit him, or he fetches them to nightly feasts which are celebrated in the company of other devils and witches. When the devil fetches them, he sits before them on the staff, fire-shovel, or whatever it be on which they ride. Or he comes on a he-goat, on which they mount: or they travel on horses which rise out of the earth. They find at the place of rendezvous many witches, some of them who have long been dead, and others ladies of station, who are masked. Their paramours, however, are only servants of the chief devil, who, in the shape of a he-goat, with a black man's face, sits solemnly on a tall chair, or on a stone table in the middle of the circle where all do homage to him by curtseys and kisses. He also appoints witch queens. Sable candles which burn between the horns of the he-goat light up the unsatisfactory meal. They there relate what mischief they have done and resolve upon new ones. If the devil disapproves of their deeds, he chastises them. After the meal, which neither satisfies nor nourishes, the dance begins. The musician sits on a tree: his fiddle is a horse's head; his pipe is a cudgel or a cat's tail; in the dance they turn round backward, and in the morning there are seen in the grass the intersecting traces of the hoofs of cows and goats. When the dance is over, they flog one another with flails or mangle-rollers; finally, they burn a great he-goat to ashes, which are distributed among the witches as a means of mischief. A young witch is not at once admitted to the feast and dance, and is set on one side to take care of toads with a white stick. The return home is in the same manner as the going thither. The husband, who all the time has had a piece of wood in bed in the place of his wife, knows nothing of the affair. The mischief chiefly done by the witches are on the corn and cattle of their neighbors. They milk the cows of others without approaching them. They stick a knife into an oaken post, hang a

string to it, down which the milk flows, or they strike an axe into the door post, and milk out of the axe-handle. Good milk they turn blue or bloody; if they shake milk it will produce no butter, and therefore witches are styled milk thieves. Bewitched milk must be whipped in a pot, or a sickle must be run through it, and every stroke or cut is felt on the body of the witch" (History of Magic, vol. ii, p. 196–198).

Horst states of the witch trials at Arras that very many people were inhumanly burnt with fire for having had nocturnal meetings with the devil, who had given them much gold. Very many gentlemen and ladies of condition were arrested upon the evidence of those who were burnt and most barbarously tortured. Others purchased their escape with gold, some fled the country, but others suffered the torture steadfastly, and would confess nothing.

Sir Walter Scott, in his "Demonology and Witchcraft," gives an account of the trials of people for *lycanthropy*, a miserable form of melancholy and superstition current in France and other countries, in which the victims either imagined they were wolves or conducted themselves in the manner of wolves. They would sometimes be seized with a species of fury and rush out and make havoc among the flocks, slaying and wasting, like the animal represented, destroying far more than could be devoured.

"In 1534 Elizabeth Barton 'the Maid of Kent' was executed for witchcraft in England, together with seven men who had been confederate with her. In 1541, the earl of Hungerford was beheaded for inquiring of a witch how long Henry VIII. would live. In 1549 it was made the duty of bishops, by Archbishop Cranmer's articles of visitation, to inquire of their clergy whether they knew of any that used charms, sorcery, enchantments, witchcraft, soothsaying, or any like craft invented by the devil. In 1563, the king of Sweden carried four witches with him, as a part of his armament, to aid him in his wars with the Danes. In 1576, seventeen or eighteen were condemned in Essex, England. A single judge or inquisitor, Remigius, condemned and burned nine

hundred within fifteen years, from 1580 to 1595, in the single district of Lorraine, and as many more fled out of the country; whole villages were depopulated; and fifteen persons destroyed themselves rather than submit to the torture, which under this successor of Draco and rival of Jeffries was the first step taken in the trial of accused persons. The application of the rack and other instruments of torment, in the examination of prisoners, was recommended by him in a work on witchcraft. He observes that scarcely any one was known to be brought to repentance and confession but by these means."

"The most eminent persons of the sixteenth century were believers in the popular superstition respecting the existence of compacts between Satan and human beings, and in the notions associated with it. The excellent Melancthon, was an interpreter of dreams and caster of nativities; Luther, was a strenuous supporter of the doctrine of witchcraft, and seems to have seriously believed that he had had frequent interviews with the arch-enemy himself and had disputed with him on points of theology face to face. In his 'Table Talk' he gives the following account of his intimacy with the devil: Speaking of his confinement in the castle of Wartburg, he says, 'Among other things, they brought me hazel-nuts, which I put into a box, and sometimes I used to crack and eat them. In the night time, my gentleman, the devil, came and got the nuts out of the box and cracked them against one of the bed posts, making a very great noise and rumbling about my bed; but I regarded him nothing at all. When afterwards I began to slumber, then he kept such a racket and rumbling upon the chamber stairs as if many empty barrels and hogsheads had been tumbled down" (Upham's Salem Witchcraft, vol. i, pp. 343–345).

The following is the language addressed to Queen Elizabeth by Bishop Jewell, who was one of the most learned persons of his age, and has long been regarded as a mighty champion of the Church of England and the cause of the Reformation in Great Britain, and a great foe to Catholic superstition: "It may please your Grace to understand that

witches and sorcerers within these last four years are marvelously increased within your Grace's realm; their color fadeth, their flesh rotteth, their speech is numbed, their senses are bereft. I pray God they never practise further upon the subject."

It is not improbable that Spenser gave expression to the sentiment relative to witches that prevailed in the sixteenth century in his "Faërie Queen":

"There, in a gloomy hollow glen, she found
A little cottage built of sticks and weedes,
In homely wise, and wald with sods around,
In which a witch did dwell in loathly weedes
An wilful want, all careless of her needes;
So, choosing solitarie to abide,
Far from all neighbors, that her devilish deedes
And hellish arts from people she might hide,
And hurt far off unknowne whomever she envide."

In view of the great extent to which the superstitions pertaining to witchcraft were carried in the sixteenth century, a French Roman Catholic historian said, "So great folly did then oppress the miserable world, that Christians believed greater absurdities than could ever be imposed upon the heathens."

The following canon, characteristic of the times, was enacted by the convocation of the English Church in 1603: "That no minister or ministers, without license and direction of the bishop, under the hand and seal obtained, attempt, upon any pretense whatever, either of possession or obsession, by fasting and prayer, to cast out any devil or devils, under the pain of the imputation of imposture or cozenage, and deposition from the ministry." In the same year, licenses were actually granted, as required above, by the bishop of Chester, and several ministers were duly authorized by him to cast out devils.

Thus says Upham: "During this whole century there were trials and executions for witchcraft in all civilized countries. More than two hundred were hanged in England; thousands

were burned in Scotland, and still larger numbers in various parts of Europe."

Edward Fairfax, the poet, was one of the most accomplished men of England. He was the celebrated translator of Tasso's "Jerusalem Delivered"; but this same learned man was so far a subject of the prevailing superstition as to cause the prosecution of six of his neighbors' children for bewitching his own children.

In 1634 Urbian Grandier, a learned and eminent French minister, rendered himself odious to the bigoted nuns of Loudun by his moderation towards heretics. Secretly instigated, as has been supposed, by Cardinal Richelieu, against whom he had written a satire, they pretended to be bewitched by him and procured his prosecution; he was tortured upon the rack until he swooned, and then was burned at the stake. In 1640, Dr. Lamb, of London, was murdered in the streets of that city by the mob, on suspicion of witchcraft. Several were hanged in England. Some were tried by the water ordeal and even drowned by the process. If they floated they were pronounced witches and were drowned any way; but if they sunk and were drowned, although they were thus proved innocent of witchcraft, their fate was equally as bad.

The celebrated witch trials at Marbais in England, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, were equal in severity and intolerance to any that took place on the continent. In speaking of these English persecutions against witchcraft in England, Sir Walter Scott says: "There was now approaching a time when the law against witchcraft, sufficiently bloody in itself, was to be pushed to more violent extremities than the quiet skepticism of the Church of England clergy gave way to. The great civil war had been preceded and anticipated by the fierce disputes of the ecclesiastical parties. The rash and ill-judged attempt to enforce upon the Scottish a compliance with the government and ceremonies of the High Church divines, and the severe prosecutions in the Star Chamber and Prerogative Courts, had given the Presbyterian system for a season a great degree of popularity in

England; and as the king's party declined during the civil war, and the state of Church government was altered, the influence of the Calvinistical divines increased. With much strict morality and pure practice of religion, it is to be regretted these were still marked by unhesitating belief in the existence of sorcery, and a keen desire to extend and enforce the legal penalties against it. Wier has considered the clergy of every sect as being too eager in this species of persecution. *Ad gravem hanc impietatem, connivent theologi plerique omnes.* But it is not to be denied that the Presbyterian ecclesiastics, who, in Scotland, were often appointed by the Privy Council commissioners for the trial of witchcraft, evinced a very extraordinary degree of credulity in such cases, and that the temporary superiority of the same sect in England was marked by enormous cruelties of this kind. To this general error we must impute the misfortune that good men, such as Calamy and Baxter, should have countenanced or defended such proceedings as those of the impudent and cruel wretch called Matthew Hopkins, who, in those unsettled times, when men did what seemed good in their own eyes, assumed the title of Witchfinder-General, and traveling through the counties of Essex, Sussex, Norfolk, and Huntingdon, pretended to discover witches, superintending their examination by the most unheard-of tortures, and compelling forlorn and miserable wretches to admit and confess matters equally absurd and impossible, the issue of which was the forfeiture of their lives. Before examining these cases more minutely, I will quote Baxter's own words, for no one can have less desire to wrong a devout and conscientious man, such as that divine most unquestionably was, though borne aside on this occasion by prejudice and credulity" (Demonology and Witchcraft, pp. 216, 217).

"The hanging of a great number of witches in 1645 and 1646 is famously known. Mr. Calamy went along with the judges on the circuit to hear their confessions, and see there was no fraud or wrong done them. I spoke with many understanding, pious, learned, and credible persons that lived

in the counties, and some that went to them in the prisons and heard their sad confessions. Among the rest, an old *reading parson*, named Lowis, not far from Framlingham, was one that was hanged, who confessed that he had two imps, and that one of them was always putting him upon doing mischief; and he being near the sea, as he saw a ship under sail, it moved him to send it to sink the ship; and he consented, and saw the ship sink before them." Scott continues: "Mr. Baxter passes on to another story of a mother, who gave her child an imp like a mole, and told her to keep it in a can near the fire and she would never want, and more such stuff as nursery-maids tell froward children to keep them quiet."

"It is remarkable that in this passage, Baxter names the Witchfinder-General rather slightly, as 'one Hopkins,' and without doing him the justice due to one who had discovered more than one hundred witches, and brought them to confessions which that good man received as indubitable. Perhaps the learned divine was one of those who believed that the Witchfinder-General had cheated the devil out of a certain memorandum book, in which Satan, for the benefit of his memory certainly, had entered all the witches' names in England, and that Hopkins availed himself of this record.

"It may be noticed that times of misrule and violence seem to create individuals fitted to take advantage from them, and having a character suited to the seasons which raise them into notice and action; just as a blight on any tree or vegetable calls to life a peculiar insect to feed upon and enjoy the decay which it has produced. A monster like Hopkins could only have existed during the confusion of civil dissension. He was, perhaps, a native of Manningtree, in Essex, at any rate, he resided there in the year 1644, when an epidemic outcry of witchcraft arose in that town. Upon this occasion he had made himself busy, and affecting more zeal and knowledge than other men, learned his trade of a witchfinder, as he pretends, from experiment. He was afterwards permitted to perform it as a legal profession, and moved from one place to another, with an assistant named Sterne and a female. In his

defense against an accusation of fleecing the country, he declares his regular charge was twenty shillings a town, including charges of living, and journeying thither and back again with his assistants. He also affirms that he went nowhere unless called and invited. His principal mode of discovery was, to strip the accused persons naked, and thrust pins into various parts of their body, to discover the witch's mark, which was supposed to be inflicted by the devil, as a sign of his sovereignty, and at which she was also said to suckle her imps. He also practiced and stoutly defended the trial by swimming; when the suspected person was wrapped in a sheet, having the great toes and thumbs tied together, and so dragged through a pond or river. If she sunk, it was received in favor of the accused; but if the body floated, which must have occurred ten times for once, if it was placed with care on the surface of the water, the accused was condemned, on the principle of King James, who, in treating of this mode of trial, lays down, that as witches have renounced their baptism, thus it is just that the element through which the holy rite is enforced should reject them; which is a figure of speech and no argument. It was Hopkins' custom to keep the poor wretches waking, in order to prevent them from having encouragement from the devil, and doubtless to put infirm, terrified, over-watched persons in the next state to absolute madness; and, for the same purpose, they were dragged about by their keepers, till extreme weariness and the pain of blistered feet might form additional inducements to confession. Hopkins confesses these last practices of keeping the accused persons waking, and forcing them to walk for the same purpose had been originally used by him. . . . The boast of the English nation is a manly independence and common sense, which will not long permit the license of tyranny or oppression on the meanest and most obscure sufferers. Many clergymen and gentlemen made head against the practices of this cruel oppressor of the defenseless, and it required courage to do so when such an unscrupulous villain had so much interest.

"Mr. Gaul, a clergyman of Houghton, in Huntingdonshire, had the courage to appear in print on the weaker side; and Hopkins, in consequence, assumed the assurance to write to some functionaries of the place the following letter, which is an admirable medley of impudence, bullying, and cowardice: 'My service to your worship presented. I have this day received a letter to come to a town called Great Houghton to search for evil-disposed persons, called witches (though I hear your minister is far against us, through ignorance). I intend to come, God willing, the sooner to hear his singular judgment in the behalf of such parties. I have known a minister in Suffolk as much against this discovery in a pulpit, and forced to recant it by the committee [of Parliament] in the same place. I much marvel such evil men should have any (much more any of the clergy, who should daily speak terror to convince such offenders) stand up to take their parts against such as are complainants for the king, and sufferers themselves, with their families and estates. I intend to give your town a visit suddenly. I will come to Kimbolton this week, and it will be ten to one but I will come to your town first; but I would certainly know before whether your town affords many sticklers for such cattle, or is willing to give and allow us good welcome and entertainment, as others where I have been, else I shall waive your shire (not as yet beginning in any part of it myself), and betake me to such places where I do and may punish (not only) without control, but with thanks and recompense. So I humbly take my leave, and rest your servant, to be commanded. MATTHEW HOPKINS."

Sir Walter again continues: "The sensible and courageous Mr. Gaul describes the tortures employed by this fellow as equal to any practiced in the Inquisition. 'Having taken the suspected witch, she is placed in the middle of a room, upon a stool or table, cross-legged, or in some other uneasy posture, to which, if she submits not, she is then bound with cords: there she is watched, and kept without meat or sleep for four-and-twenty hours; for they say they shall, within that time, see her imp come and suck. A little hole is likewise made

in the door for the imps to come in at; and lest they should come in some less discernible shape, they that watch are taught to be ever and anon sweeping the room; and if they see any spiders or flies to kill them, and if they cannot kill them they may be sure they are their imps.'"

The learned writer next gives an account of the persecutions against the Rev. Mr. Lewis, who had maintained a good character in the vicarage of Brandiston, in Suffolk, about fifty years, who, after being driven almost to insanity by continued torture, was made to confess that, by the aid of his imp, he had been the cause of the sinking of a vessel, the existence of which, even, was not proved. Notwithstanding that he defended himself with ability at his trial, he was convicted and executed.

Sir Walter again continues: "We have seen that, in 1647, Hopkins' tone became lowered, and he began to disavow some of the cruelties he had formerly practiced. About the same time, a miserable old woman had fallen into the cruel hands of this miscreant near Hoxne, a village in Suffolk, and had confessed all the usual enormities, after being without food or rest a sufficient time. Her imp, she said, was called Nan. A gentleman in the neighborhood, whose widow survived to authenticate the story, was so indignant that he went to the house, took the woman out of such inhuman hands, dismissed the witchfinders, and after due food and rest, the poor old woman could recollect nothing of the confession, but that she gave a favorite pullet the name of Nan.

"In the year 1645 a commission of Parliament was sent down, comprehending two clergymen in esteem with the leading party, one of whom, Mr. Fairclough, of Keller, preached before the rest on the subject of witchcraft; and after this appearance of inquiry, the inquisitions and executions went on as before. But the popular indignation was so strongly excited against Hopkins that some gentlemen seized on him and put him to his own favorite experiment of swimming, on which, as he happened to float, he stood convicted of witchcraft, and so the country was rid of him. Whether he was

drowned outright or not does not exactly appear" (page 222). That he was executed for the very offense for which he had caused so many to inhumanly suffer is a source of great satisfaction. Few, whose death historians are called upon to record, have been more gladly noticed in their departure from the world than this inhuman wretch—this pious, religious monster.

Sir Walter, on page 224, further remarks: "In the year 1663 an old dame, named Julian Coxe, was convicted chiefly on the evidence of a huntsman, who declared on his oath that he laid his grey-hounds on a hare, and coming up to the spot where he saw them mouth her, there he found, on the other side of a bush, Julian Coxe, lying panting and breathless, in such a manner as to convince him that she had been the creature which had afforded him the course. The unhappy woman was executed on this evidence.

"Two years afterwards, 1664, it is with regret we must quote the venerable and devout Sir Matthew Hale, as presiding at a trial, in consequence of which Amy Dunny and Rose Callender, were hanged at St. Edmondsbury. But no man, unless very peculiarly circumstanced, can extricate himself from the prejudices of his nation and age. The evidence against the accused was laid, first, on the effect of spells used by ignorant persons to counteract the supposed witchcraft; the use of which was, under the statute of James I., as criminal as the act of sorcery which such counter-charms were meant to neutralize. Second, The two old women, refused even the privilege of purchasing some herrings, having expressed themselves with angry impatience, a child of the herring-merchant fell ill in consequence. Thirdly, A cart was driven against the miserable cottage of Amy Dunny. She scolded, of course: and shortly after the cart—what a good driver will scarcely comprehend—stuck fast in a gate, where its wheels touched neither of the posts, and yet was moved easily forward on one of the posts (by which it was *not* impeded) being cut down. Fourthly, One of the afflicted girls, being closely muffled, went suddenly into a fit, upon

being touched by one of the supposed witches. But upon an another trial, it was found that the person so blindfolded fell into the same rage at the touch of an unsuspected person. What perhaps sealed the fate of the accused was the evidence of the celebrated Sir Thomas Browne, 'that the fits were natural, but heightened by the power of the devil, coöperating with the malice of witches'—a strange opinion, certainly, from the author of the treatise on 'Vulgar Errors.'"

"We are informed by Roger North that a case of this kind [conviction upon confession] happened at the assizes in Exeter, where his brother, the Lord Chief-Justice, did not interfere with the crown trials, and the other judge left for execution a poor old woman, condemned, as usual, on her own confession, and on the testimony of a neighbor, who deponed that he saw a cat jump into the accused person's cottage window at twilight, one evening, and that he verily believed the said cat to be the devil; on which precious testimony the poor wretch was accordingly hanged. On another occasion, about the same time, the passions of the great and little vulgar were so much excited by the acquittal of an aged village dame, whom the judge had taken some pains to rescue, that Sir John Long, a man of rank and fortune, came to the judge in the greatest perplexity, requesting that the hag might not be permitted to return to her miserable cottage on his estate, since all his tenants had, in that case, threatened to leave him. In compassion to a gentleman who apprehended ruin from a cause so whimsical, the dangerous old woman was appointed to be kept by the town where she was acquitted, at the rate of half a crown a week, paid by the parish to which she belonged. But, behold! in the period between the two assizes, Sir John Long and his farmers had mustered courage enough to petition that this witch should be sent back to them in all her terrors, because they could support her among them at a shilling a week cheaper than they were obliged to pay to the town for her maintenance. In a subsequent trial before Lord Chief-Justice North himself, that judge detected one of those practices which, it is to be feared, were too

common at the time—when witnesses found their advantage in feigning themselves bewitched. A woman, supposed to be the victim of the male sorcerer at the bar, vomited pins in quantities, and those straight, differing from the crooked pins usually produced at such times, and less easily concealed in the mouth. The judge, however, discovered, by cross-examining a candid witness, that in counterfeiting her fits of convulsion, the woman sunk her head on her breast so as to take up with her lips the pins which she had placed ready in her stomacher. The man was acquitted, of course. A frightful old hag, who was present, distinguished herself so much by her benedictions on the judge that he asked the cause of the peculiar interest which she took in the acquittal. 'Twenty years ago,' said the poor woman, 'they would have hanged me for a witch, but could not; and now, but for your lordship, they would have murdered my innocent son.'

"As late as 1682, three unhappy women, named Susan Edwards, Mary Trembles, and Temperance Lloyd, were hanged at Exeter for witchcraft, and, as usual, on their own confession. This is believed to be the last execution of the kind in England under form of judicial sentence. But the ancient superstition, so interesting to vulgar credulity, like sediment clearing itself from water, sunk down in a deeper shade upon the ignorant and lowest class of society, in proportion as the higher regions were purified from its influence. The populace, including the ignorant of every class, were more enraged against witches, when their passions were once excited, in proportion to the lenity exercised towards the objects of their indignation by those who administered the laws. Several cases occurred in which the mob, impressed with the conviction of the guilt of some destitute old creatures, took the law into their own hands, and, proceeding upon such evidence as Hopkins would have had recourse to, at once, in their own apprehension, ascertained their criminality, and administered the deserved punishment.

"The following instance of such illegal and inhuman proceedings occurred at Oakly, near Bedford, on the twelfth of

July, 1707. There was one woman, upwards of sixty years of age, who, being under an imputation of witchcraft, was desirous to escape from so foul a suspicion, and to conciliate the good will of her neighbors, by allowing them to duck her. The parish officers so far consented to their humane experiment as to promise the poor woman a guinea if she should clear herself by sinking. The unfortunate object was tied up in a wet sheet, her thumbs and great toes were bound together, her cap torn off, and all her apparel searched for pins, for there is an idea that a single pin spoils the operation of the charm. She was then dragged through the river Ouse by a rope tied around her middle. Unhappily for the poor woman, her body floated, though her head remained under water. The experiment was made three times with the same effect. The cry to hang or drown the witch then became general; and as she lay half dead on the bank, they loaded the wretch with reproaches, and hardly forbore blows. A single humane bystander took her part, and exposed himself to rough usage for doing so. Luckily one of the mob themselves at length suggested the additional experiment of weighing the witch against the church Bible. The friend of humanity caught at this means of escape, supporting the proposal by the staggering argument that the Scripture, being the work of God himself, must outweigh necessarily all the operations or vassals of the devil. The reasoning was received as conclusive, the more readily as it promised a new species of amusement. The woman was then weighed by the church Bible of twelve pounds, jockey weight, and as she was considerably preponderant, was dismissed with honor. But many of the mob counted her acquittal irregular, and would have had the poor dame drowned or hanged on the result of her ducking, as the more authentic species of trial.

"At length a similar piece of inhumanity, which had a very different conclusion, led to the final abolition of the statute of James I., as affording countenance for such brutal proceedings. An aged pauper, named Osborn, and his wife, who resided near Tring, in Staffordshire, fell under the

suspicion of the mob on account of supposed witchcraft. The overseers of the poor, understanding that the rabble entertained a purpose of 'swimming' these infirm creatures, which, indeed, they had expressed in a sort of proclamation, endeavored to oppose their purpose by securing the unhappy couple in the vestry-room which they barricaded. They were unable, however, to protect them in the manner they intended. The mob forced the door, seized the accused, and, with ineffable brutality, continued dragging the wretches through a pool of water till the woman lost her life. A brute in human form who had superintended the murder, went among the spectators and requested money for the sport he had shown them. The life of the other victim was, with great difficulty, saved. Three men were tried for their share in this inhuman action. Only one of them, named Colley, was condemned and hanged. When he came to execution the rabble, instead of crowding around the gallows as usual, stood at a distance, and abused those who were putting to death, they said, an honest fellow for ridding the parish of an accursed witch. This abominable murder was committed on the thirtieth of July, 1751" (pp. 230–232)

Upon the subject of the persecutions of witches, B. F. Underwood, in "The Crimes and Cruelties of Christianity," pp. 20–27, speaks as follows: "Persecution for witchcraft and sorcery was carried on by Protestants as well as by Catholics. They were generally believed in among the former as among the latter. Luther said, 'I should have no compassion on these witches: I would burn them all' (Table Talk, p. 251). Calvin, when he remodeled the laws of Geneva, did not change those condemning witches to the stake." He then makes the following quotations from standard authorities:

"In England the establishment of the Reformation was the signal for an immediate outburst of the superstition; and there, as elsewhere, its decline was represented by the clergy as the direct consequence and the exact measure of the progress of religious skepticism. In Scotland, where the Reformed ministers exercised greater influence than in any other country,

and where the witch trials fell almost entirely into their hands, the persecution was proportionately atrocious. Probably the ablest defender of the belief was Glanvil, a clergyman of the English Establishment, and one of the most influential was Baxter, the greatest of the Puritans" (Hist. Rat., vol. i. p. 33).

Lecky says: "During the few years of the [English] Commonwealth there is reason to believe that more alleged witches perished in England than in the whole period before and after. Nor is this to be ascribed entirely to the judges or legislators: for the judges in former reigns never shrank from condeming witches, and Cromwell was in most respects far superior to his predecessors. It was simply the natural result of Puritanical teaching acting on the mind, predisposing men to see Satanic influence in life, and consequently eliciting the phenomena of witchcraft" (Hist. of Rat., vol. i. p. 125).

In 1664 two women were hanged in Suffolk, England, under a sentence of the eminent Sir Matthew Hale, who availed himself of the occasion to declare the reality of the crime of witchcraft, "for first," said he, "the Scriptures had affirmed so much, and secondly, the wisdom of all nations had provided laws against such persons, which is an argument of their confidence of such a crime." The last person that perished judicially for witchcraft in England was executed in 1712. The last prominent trial was that of Jane Wenham, who was prosecuted by a Hertfordshire clergyman in 1712. "The judge entirely disbelieved in witches, and accordingly charged the jury strongly in favor of the accused, and even treated with great disrespect the rector of the parish, who declared 'on his faith as a clergyman' that he believed the woman to be a witch. The jury being ignorant and obstinate, convicted the prisoner," but a remission of sentence was obtained in spite of the efforts of the clergy. The laws relating to witchcraft were not repealed until the year 1736. The clergy still believed in it, and used the influence of their position in favor of prosecutions to the last. In reviewing

the history of witchcraft. "it is impossible to avoid observing the singularly favorable contrast which the Anglican Church presents, both to continental Catholicism and Puritanism. It is indeed true that her bishops contributed much to the enactment of the laws against witchcraft, that the immense majority of the clergy firmly believed in the reality of the crime, and that they continued to assert and to defend it when the great bulk of educated laymen had abandoned it. It is also true that skepticism on the subject of witches arose among those who were least governed by the Church, advanced with the decline of the influence of the clergy, and was commonly branded as a phase and manifestation of Infidelity" (Ibid).

As late as 1768, more than thirty years after the repeal of the disgraceful laws respecting witchcraft, John Wesley, the great light of Methodism, wrote as follows:

"It is true, likewise, that the English in general, and indeed most of the men of learning in Europe, have given up all accounts of witches and apparitions as mere old wives' fables. I am sorry for it, and I willingly take this opportunity of entering my solemn protest against this violent compliment which so many that believe the Bible pay to those who do not believe it. I owe them no such service. I take knowledge that these are at the bottom of the outcry which has been raised and with such insolence spread through the land, in direct opposition not only to the Bible, but to the suffrage of the wisest and best of men in all ages and nations. They well know (whether Christians know it or not) that the giving up witchcraft is in effect giving up the Bible" (Journal, 1768).

Skepticism advanced more slowly in Scotland than in England, and Captain Burt, in his "Letters from the North of Scotland," observes that in that country the belief in witchcraft was quite common at a time when it was abandoned by the educated classes of England. He visited the country in 1730, and speaks of a woman who was burnt as late as 1727 (vol. i, pp. 227–277). "In 1773," says Macaulay, "the divines of the Associated Presbytery passed a resolution declaring their belief in witchcraft, and expressing deep regret at the

skepticism that was common" (Hist. of England, vol. iii, p. 706).

The history of persecution for witchcraft in Scotland is terrible.

"In other lands the superstition was at least mixed with much of imposture; in Scotland it appears to have been entirely undiluted. It was produced by the teaching of the clergy, and it was everywhere fostered by their persecution. Eagerly, passionately, with a thirst for blood that knew no mercy, with a zeal that never tired, did they accomplish their task. Assembled in solemn synod, the college of Aberdeen, in 1603, enjoined every minister to take two of the elders of his parish to make 'a subtle and privy inquisition,' and to question all the parishioners upon oath as to their knowledge of witches. Boxes were placed in the churches for the express purpose of receiving the accusations. When a woman had fallen under suspicion, the minister from the pulpit denounced her by name, exhorted the parishioners to give evidence against her, and prohibited any one from sheltering her. In the same spirit he exerted the power which was given him by a parochial organization, elaborated perhaps more skillfully than any other in Europe. Under these circumstances, the witch cases seem to have fallen almost entirely into the hands of the clergy; they were the leading commissioners. Before them the confessions were taken. They were the acquiescing witnesses or the directors of the tortures by which those confessions were elicited" (Hist. Rat. vol. i, pp. 144, 145).

These tortures were of the worst possible character. "If the witch was obdurate, the first, and it was said the most effectual, method of obtaining confession was by what was termed 'waking her.' An iron bridle or hoop was bound across her face, with four prongs, which were thrust into her mouth. It was fastened behind to the wall by a chain, in such a manner that the victim was unable to lie down; and in this position she was sometimes kept for several days, while men were constantly with her to prevent her from closing her eyes for a moment in sleep. Partly in order to effect this

object and partly to discover the insensible mark which was the sure sign of a witch, long pins were thrust into her body. At the same time, as it was a saying in Scotland that a witch would never confess while she could drink, excessive thirst was often added to her tortures. Some prisoners have been 'waked' for five nights: one, it is said, even for nine. But other and perhaps worse tortures were in reserve. . . . The three principal that were habitually applied were the pennywinkis, the boots, and the caschielawis. The first was a kind of thumb-screw; the second was a frame in which the leg was inserted, and in which it was broken by wedges, driven in by a hammer: the third was also an iron frame for the leg, which was from time to time heated over a brazier. Fire-matches were sometimes applied to the body of the victim. We read in a contemporary legal register of one man who was kept for forty-eight hours in 'vehement tortour' in the caschielawis, and of another who remained in the same frightful machine for eleven days and eleven nights, whose legs were broken daily for fourteen days in the boots, and who was so scourged that the whole skin was torn from the body. This was, it is true, censured as an extreme case, but it was only an excessive application of the common torture."

"How many confessions were extorted, and how many victims perished by these means, it is now impossible to say. A vast number of depositions and confessions are preserved, but they were only taken before a single court, and many others took cognizance of the crime. We know that in 1672, more than a hundred and fifty persons were accused of witchcraft; and that in the preceding year no less than fourteen commissions had been issued for the trials. After these facts it is scarcely necessary to notice how one traveler casually mentions having seen nine women burned together at Leith, in 1664, or how in 1678 nine others were condemned in a single day. . . . An earl of Mar (who appears to have been the only person sensible of the inhumanity of the proceedings), tells how, with a piercing yell, some women once broke half burnt from the slow fire that consumed them, struggled

for a few moments with despairing energy among the spectators, but soon, with shrieks of blasphemy and wild protestations of innocence, sank writhing in agony amid the flames" (Ibid, pp. 145–148).

The clergy, all over Scotland, applauded and stimulated the persecution. "The ascendency they had obtained was boundless, and in this respect their power was entirely undisputed. One word from them might have arrested the tortures, but that word was never spoken. Their conduct implies not merely a mental aberration, but also a callousness of feeling which has rarely been attained in a long career of vice. Yet these were men who had often shown, in the most trying circumstances, the highest and the most heroic virtues. . . . It is not on them that our blame should fall; it is on the system that made them what they were. They were but illustrations of the great truth, that when men have come to regard a certain class of their fellow-creatures as doomed by the Almighty to eternal and excruciating agonies, and when their theology directs their minds with intense and realizing earnestness to the contemplation of such agonies, the result will be an indifference to the suffering of those whom they deem the enemies of their God, as absolute as it is perhaps possible for human nature to attain (Ibid, pp. 149, 150).

"It is probable that no class of victims endured sufferings so unalloyed and so intense. Not for them the wild fanaticism that nerves the soul against danger, and almost steels the body against torments. Not for them the assurance of a glorious eternity that has made the martyr look with exultation on the rising flame, as on the Elijah's chariot that is to bear his soul to heaven. Not for them the solace of lamenting friends, or the consciousness that their memories would be cherished and honored by posterity. They died alone, hated and unpitied. They were deemed by all mankind the worst of criminals. Their very kinsmen shrank from them as tainted and accursed. The superstitions they had imbibed in childhood, blending with the illusions of age, and with the horrors of their position, persuaded them in many cases that

they were indeed the bond-slaves of Satan, and were about to exchange their torments upon earth for an agony that was as excruciating, and was eternal. And besides all this, we have to consider the terrors which the belief must have spread through the people at large; we have to picture the anguish of the mother as she imagined that it was in the power of one whom she had offended to blast in a moment every object of her affection; we have to conceive, above all, the awful shadow that the dread of accusation must have thrown on the enfeebled faculties of age, and the bitterness it must have added to desertion and to solitude. All these sufferings were the result of a single superstition which the spirit of rationalism has destroyed (Ibid, pp. 153–4).

That this superstition is taught in the Bible, and that all these tortures and executions, together with thousands of which no record is preserved, were in obedience to the command, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," do not admit of doubt and cannot be denied by any candid mind.

The following is from Upham, vol. i, pp. 371, 372, 373.

"Dr. Balthasar Bekker, of Amsterdam, who was equally eminent in astronomy, philosophy, and theology, published in 1691 a learned and powerful work, called 'The World Bewitched,' in which he openly assailed the doctrines of witchcraft and of the devil, and anticipated many of the views and arguments presented in Farmer's excellent publications. As a reward for his exertions to enlighten his fellow-creatures, he was turned out of the ministry, and assaulted by nearly all the writers of his age.

"Dr. Bekker was one of the ablest and boldest writers of his day, and did much to advance the cause of natural science, scriptural interpretation, and the principles of enlightened Christianity. In 1680 he published an 'Inquiry concerning Comets,' rescuing them from the realm of superstition, placing them within the natural physical laws, and exploding the then-received opinion, that, in any way, they are the presages or fore-runners of evil. His 'Exposition on the Prophet Daniel' gives proof of his learning and judg-

ment. His great merits were recognized by John Locke and Richard Bentley. In the preface to his 'World Bewitched,' he says, that it grieved him to see the great honors, powers, and miracles which are ascribed to the devil. 'It has come to that pass,' to use his own language, 'that men think it piety and godliness to ascribe a great many wonders to the devil, and impiety and heresy, if a man will not believe that the devil can do what a thousand persons say he does. It is now reckoned godliness, if a man who fears God fear also the devil. If he be not afraid of the devil, he passes for an Atheist, who does not believe in God, because he cannot think that there are two gods, the one good, and the other bad. But these, I think, with much more reason, may be called Ditheits. For my part, if, on account of my opinion, they will give me a new name, let them call me a monotheist, a believer of but one God.' The work struck down the whole system of demonology and witchcraft, by proving that there never was really such a thing as sorcery or possession, and that devils have no influence over human affairs or the persons of men. It is not surprising that it raised a great clamor. The wonder is that it did not cost him his life. It is probable that his protection was the confidence the people had in his character and learning. Attempts were made to diminish that confidence, and bring him into odium, by leveling against him every form of abuse. A medal was struck, and extensively circulated, representing the devil, clothed like a minister or priest, riding on an ass. The device was so arranged as to excite ridicule and abhorrence, in the vulgar mind, against Bekker. But it was found impossible to turn the popular feeling, which had set in his favor; and his persecutors and defamers were completely baffled. He was followed, soon after, by the learned Thomasius, whose writings against demonology produced a decided effect upon the convictions of the age.

"While Bekker, and the other writers of his class, endeavored to overthrow the superstitious practices and fancies then prevalent respecting demonology and communications with

spiritual beings, they so far acceded to the popular theology as to maintain the doctrine of the personality of the devil. They believed in the existence of the arch-fiend, but denied his agency in human affairs. They held that he was kept confined 'to bottomless perdition, there to dwell—

"In adamantine chains and penal fires."

"Sir Robert Filmer, in 1680, published 'An Advertisement to the jurymen of England, touching Witches,' in which he criticised and condemned many of the opinions and methods then countenanced on the subject."

A large volume could be filled with the intolerant cruelties practiced upon those unfortunate wretches accused of being witches, in England, Scotland, and other European countries not here mentioned; but they must be passed over in silence to allow brief mention to be made of the persecutions of witches in America, which arose from the same spirit of bigotry and persecution that for centuries had prevailed in many of the nations of Europe.

The religious superstition which the colonists brought over from Europe afforded a fertile soil for the dire evils and vagaries of witchcraft. The belief in an ever-present, personal devil was general. The clergy preached it from the pulpit, and almost every individual unfalteringly believed in the old "Evil One." It was not uncommon for certain of the devout ones to report having seen the devil, horns, hoofs and all. The Rev. John Higginson, a Puritan clergyman, in a letter to Increase Mather detailed an account of how the devil called upon a young man by the name of Sharp and presented him with a book, saying: "Here is a book for you; keep this till I call for it again." Young Sharp being fond of reading soon began to peruse the work, whereupon a strange kind of horror seized him, both of body and mind, which caused the hair of his head to stand upon end, which continued until he closed the book. Upon repeating the same on subsequent occasions and experiencing the same results, he acquainted his master with the facts. They at once concluded that it was a conjur-

ing book and that it was the devil who brought it. The book was cast into the flames and the devil never afterwards called for it.

The Rev. Cotton Mather, entertained a profound fear of the devil, and in one of his sermons says:

"No place, that I know of, has got such a spell upon it as will always keep the devil out. The meeting-house, wherein we assemble for the worship of God, is filled with many holy people and many holy concerns continually; but, if our eyes were so refined as the servant of the prophet had his of old, I suppose we should now see a throng of devils in this very place.

"When we are in our church assemblies, oh, how many devils, do you imagine, crowd in among us! There is a devil that rocks one to sleep. There is a devil that makes another to be thinking of, he scarcely knows what himself. And there is a devil that makes another to be pleasing himself with wanton and wicked speculations. It is also possible that we have our closets or our studies gloriously perfumed with devotions every day; but, alas! can we shut the devil out of them? No; let us go where we will, we shall still find a devil nigh unto us. Only when we come to heaven, we shall be out of his reach forever."

When such a firm belief in devils prevailed, it can be understood how easy it was to transplant on American soil the blighting superstition about witches that had so long prevailed in Europe. A brief mention will here be made of some of the trials and executions for witchcraft that took place in Massachusetts, commencing about the middle of the seventeenth century.

Margaret Jones was executed as a witch in Boston, June 15, 1648.

Hugh and Mary Parsons of Springfield were arrested and tried on the charge of witchcraft, but it appears they were not executed.

A woman at Dorchester, and another at Cambridge, were executed as witches in 1650.

Mrs. Ann Hibbins, as stated by Hutchinson, was tried and executed as a witch in 1655.

The same author mentions another case that took place at Hartford, Conn., where two women were prosecuted, and who got so bewildered that one of them confessed to such preposterous particulars as to be wholly incredible. They were condemned and executed in 1669.

Another case of a similar kind took place at Hampton in 1673, but the woman was not executed.

Eunice Cole was tried in 1673 before the county court at Salisbury on the charge of witchcraft and holding familiar intercourse with the devil. She was imprisoned in Boston for a time, and then ordered to depart from that jurisdiction.

Caleb Powell, a sailor, an astronomer, and astrologer, from his rather extensive knowledge, was believed to be a wizard, and was brought before the court at Ipswich on March 30, 1680. Not being able to convict him, the charge was transferred to an old lady, Elizabeth Morse. Though the evidence against her was frivolous to the last degree, she was, nevertheless, convicted, and would have been executed had not the humane Governor Bradstreet been merciful enough to pardon her, at which many Christian people were greatly offended.

Mrs. Glover, an Irishwoman, of Boston, was executed in 1688 for bewitching four children of Mr. Goodwin's. It is believed she was partially crazy. The oldest of the children was thirteen years of age. The most experienced physicians pronounced them bewitched. Cotton Mather stated that their conduct was very extraordinary. "At one time they would bark like dogs, and then again they would pur like cats. Yes," said he, "they would fly like geese and be carried with an incredible swiftness, having but just their toes now and then upon the ground, sometimes not once in twenty feet, and their arms waved like the wings of a bird."

The period is now reached—the year 1692—when the noted phase of delusion broke out at Salem, Mass., known as the Salem Witchcraft. The general religious superstition which pervaded the Puritanic people of New England fitted

them to become ready believers in all sorts of diabolism or the great power of the devil over human beings. This Salem imposture began at the house of the Rev. Samuel Parris, the pastor of a church in that village. His daughter, Elizabeth, Ann Putnam, Mary Walcot, Mary Lewis, Elizabeth Hubbard, Susanna Sheldon, Mary Warren, Sarah Churchill, and others, including some Indians from the West Indies, were in the habit of meeting at the house of Parris to take lessons in and practice palmistry, fortune telling, necromancy, and magic. They became very expert in many arts and tricks, and showed not a little talent in acting and representing various characters. Ann Putnam, though younger than most of the others, was the leading spirit of the party, and was quick at repartee and in readily devising expedients in any emergency. They soon came to understand each other well, and acted in concert in pretending to be bewitched so as to astonish beholders. They claimed that they were choked, thrown into spasms and convulsions, and otherwise submitted to torture by persons in the neighborhood who had entered into compact with the devil; and upon such claims and pretensions large numbers of persons of all ages, and many of them of unblemished character, were arrested, thrown into prison, and subjected to an *ex parte* trial, semi-theological in character, before which the girls appeared as accusers, and declared that they had been and were tormented by the accused; and while the trials were in progress, and whenever they deemed it necessary, they went into convulsions and spasms, often falling to the floor, insisting that the accused parties were causing this distress and torture. Upon this kind of evidence multitudes of people were torn from their homes and sent to crowded, uncomfortable prisons to remain eight or ten months. Thirteen women and six men were hanged, and one infirm old man, Giles Corey, eighty-one years of age, was pressed to death under a board loaded with heavy weights until his tongue protruded from his mouth and his breath was literally crushed out of him. The society in and about Salem was greatly demoralized by these villainous charges. None

were safe. Every person was liable to fall under the ban of these accusing girls and their confidential advisers, who had not a little influence over them. A reign of terror existed in the community. The witch trials held in a church in Salem were the all-absorbing matters of interest. To avoid this cruel persecution many were forced to leave their homes, some going to Europe, and some to other localities. The state of society was utterly demoralized.

Upham, in his "Salem Witchcraft," vol. ii, p. 380, says: "The evils of this epidemic cast their shadow over a broad surface and darkened the condition of generations. . . . The fields were neglected, fences, roads, barns, even the meeting-house went into disrepair. . . . Scarcity of provisions, nearly amounting to a famine, continued for some time; farms were brought under mortgage or sacrificed, and large numbers of people were dispersed. One locality in Salem village . . . bears to this day the marks of the blight. . . . The ruinous results were not confined to the village, but spread more or less over the country."

Hutchinson, the earliest historian of these remarkable witch trials, says: "No wonder the whole country was in consternation, when persons of sober lives and unblemished characters were committed to prison upon such sort of evidence. Nobody was safe."

Space can be used to mention but a few of the cases that were brought before those witch courts, when the Rev. Cotton Mather and the Rev. Samuel Parris figured conspicuously and wielded a powerful control. Wm. Hobbs was arrested in April, 1692. A kind of mock trial was held over him, and he was sent to prison, where he remained till December, when he was admitted to bail and a fine imposed upon him. In May, 1693, the fine was remitted and he set at liberty.

Elizabeth Howe, an estimable lady, whose husband was blind, and she a mother of several children, was accused of bewitching the girls aforesaid, and was thrown into prison. Her blind husband, led by one of the children, made a trip of

several miles almost daily to visit her in her miserable cell, where she was so long confined without having committed a single wrong. She was at last executed by hanging.

Bridget Bishop, a married woman of good character, passed through a similar experience. She was hung.

Mrs. Mary Bradbury, seventy-five years of age, who for over half a century had been a faithful wife and an honorable, useful member of society, was submitted to the same accusations and trials. She was condemned to death, but the excitement spent itself before the execution was carried out, and her life was not taken.

George Jacobs, Sr., a tall, grey-headed old man, was one of the sufferers. He, too, was executed for, as was believed, being in league with the devil.

George Burroughs, a minister and a man of excellent character, was unfortunate enough to fall under the ban of the accusing girls whose attention it was thought had been directed to him by an interested party. He had previously resided in Salem, where he preached for some years, and had removed to what is now the State of Maine. But he was denounced by these bewitched girls, a legal process was issued for him, and he was sent for and brought to Salem, being compelled to leave his helpless family unprovided for, and with hardly a moment's notice. He was thrown into prison, brought before the court, and with no evidence save what the girls said of him, he was convicted and sent to the gallows.

Elizabeth Cary, wife of Jonathan Cary, was accused by two of the girls and one of the Indians. She was arrested and heavy irons were placed upon her limbs, but through the efforts of her husband she escaped to Rhode Island, and afterwards to New York, where she was kindly received by Governor Fletcher. Her husband was afterwards arrested, and the property which he had left with a friend was taken and confiscated.

John Alden was arrested and imprisoned fifteen weeks, when he was fortunate enough to make his escape.

Giles Corey's case was a hard one. He was a sufferer under High Priest Parris and his female accusers. His wife had been complained of, and he, knowing her innocence, spoke strongly in her defense. He was arraigned before the same court, but could not be induced to make a plea either of guilty or not guilty. He was a man of some property and he wished what he had to go to his children. He knew that if he confessed or plead guilty, his effects, in case of conviction, instead of going to his heirs, would be grabbed either by the Church or the court which convicted him. He adhered to his resolution, confessing nothing, and making no plea though three times brought before the legal dignitaries. In consequence of the silence he maintained, the sentence of *peine forte et dure*, from the code of King James I., was passed upon him, which was, that he be remanded to his low, damp dungeon, to be there laid upon his back on the bare floor, naked for the most part, a board to be laid upon him, and weights enough piled on the board to nearly crush the life out of him, and to have no sustenance, save on the first day three morsels of very poor bread, and on the second day three draughts of standing or stagnant water, the nearest to be found to the prison door, and this to be alternately his daily diet until he died. This horrible sentence was carried out, and the suffering that man passed through cannot be conceived. The agony of him who died upon the cross after three hours of exposure was trifling compared with the protracted agony endured by the aged Giles Corey, more than four score years old. It is said the last act in this diabolical tragedy was enacted in an open field near the prison. The wretched sufferer begged his executioners to increase the weights which were crushing him that his agonies might be ended. The hope, however, that he would yield and acknowledge his guilt, so that his property could be secured, induced them to not hurry his death. But he assured them that it was of no use to expect him to yield; that there could be but one way of ending the matter, and that they might as well pile on the rocks and have the matter ended. Calef says that as his body yielded to the

pressure, his tongue protruded from his mouth, and an official forced it back with his cane. This inhuman act is attributed to the pious Parris, who made himself so officious in the Salem trials and executions. Upham, in narrating this horrid cruelty, says: "For a person more than eighty-one years of age this must be allowed to have been a marvelous exhibition of prowess; illustrating, as strongly as anything in human history, the power of a resolute will over the utmost pain and agony of body, and demonstrating that Giles Corey was a man of heroic nerve and a spirit that could not be subdued." This was a case of Christian persecution, where the recipient was, as has been the case in thousands of other instances, vastly superior, in everything that constitutes manhood, to the person who inflicted it.

The following persons were brought to trial at one time, the grand jury having found about fifty indictments: Rebecca Jacobs, Margaret Jacobs, Sarah Buckley, Job Tookey, Hannah Tyler, Candy, Mary Marston, Elizabeth Johnson, Abigail Baker, Mary Tyler, Sarah Hawkes, Mary Wardwell, Mary Bridges, Hannah Post, Sarah Bridges, Mary Osgood, Mary Lacy, Jr., and Mary Post. The last three were condemned but not executed; all the rest were acquitted. On another day warrants were issued for the following unfortunate individuals: William Hobbs and Deliverance, his wife, Nehemiah Abbot, Jr., Mary Easty, Sarah Wilds, Edward Bishop, and Sarah his wife, Mary Black, and Mary English. On a single day these convicted victims were sentenced to death: Sarah Good, Sarah Wilds, Elizabeth How, Susanna Martin, and Rebecca Mun. They were all executed on the nineteeth of July, 1692.

"The wife of an honest and worthy man in Andover was sick of a fever. After all the usual means had failed to check the symptoms of her disease, the idea became prevalent that she was suffering under an 'evil hand.' The husband, pursuant of the advice of friends, posted down to Salem Village to ascertain from the afflicted girls who was bewitching his wife. Two of them returned with him to

Andover. Never did a place receive such fatal visitors. The Grecian horse did not bring greater consternation to ancient Ilium. Immediately after their arrival, they succeeded in getting more than fifty of the inhabitants into prison, several of whom were hanged. A perfect panic swept like a hurricane over the place. The idea seized all minds, as Hutchinson expresses it, that the only 'way to prevent an accusation was to become an accuser.' 'The number of the afflicted increased every day, and the number of the accused in proportion.' In this stage of things, such a great accession being made to the ranks of the confessing witches, the power of the delusion became irresistibly strengthened. Mr. Dudley Bradstreet, the magistrate of the place, after having committed about forty persons to jail, concluded he had done enough, and declined to arrest any more. The consequence was that he and his wife were cried out upon, and they had to fly for their lives. They accused his brother, John Bradstreet, with having 'afflicted' a dog. Bradstreet escaped by flight. The dog was executed. The number of persons who had publicly confessed that they had entered into a league with Satan, and exercised the diabolical power thus acquired, to the injury, torment, and death of innocent parties, produced a profound effect upon the public mind. At the same time, the accusers had everywhere increased in number, owing to the inflamed state of imagination universally prevalent which ascribed all ailments or diseases to the agency of witches, to a mere love of notoriety and a passion for general sympathy, to a desire to be secure against the charge of bewitching others, or to a malicious disposition to wreak vengeance upon enemies. The prisons in Salem, Ipswich, Boston, and Cambridge, were crowded. All the securities of society were dissolved. Every man's life was at the mercy of every other man. Fear sat on every countenance, terror and distress were in all hearts, silence pervaded the streets; all who could, quit the country; business was at a stand; a conviction sunk into the minds of men that a dark and infernal confederacy had got foothold in the land, threatening to overthrow and

extirpate religion and morality, and establish the kingdom of the prince of darkness in a country which had been dedicated, by the prayers and tears and sufferings of its pious fathers, to the Church of Christ, and the service and worship of the true God. The feeling, dismal and horrible indeed, became general that the providence of God was removed from them; that Satan was let loose, and he and his confederates had free and unrestrained power to go to and fro, torturing and destroying whomever he willed. We cannot, by any extent of research or power of imagination, enter fully into the ideas of the people of that day; and it is therefore absolutely impossible to appreciate the awful condition of the community at the point of time to which our narrative has led us" (Upham's Salem Witchcraft, vol. ii, pp. 247–250).

In speaking of the unjust trial and conviction of Rebecca Nurse, Upham says: "But nothing can extenuate the infamy that must for ever rest upon the names of certain parties to the proceedings. Not to attempt here to measure the guilt of the accusing witnesses, it may be mentioned that it was the deliberate conviction of the family of Rebecca Nurse that Mr. Parris, more than all other persons, was responsible for her execution; whether by his officious activity in driving on the prosecution, or in preventing her reprieve, cannot be known. Of the prominent part taken by Mr. Noyes in the cruel treatment of this woman, there is no room for doubt. The records of the First Church in Salem are darkened by the following entry: '1692, July 3.—After sacrament, the elders propounded to the church—and it was, by an unanimous vote, consented to—that our sister Nurse, being a convicted witch by the Court, and condemned to die, should be excommunicated: which was accordingly done in the afternoon, she being present'" (Ibid, p. 290).

In speaking of the minister, George Burroughs, Upham uses this language: "A review of what can be gleaned in reference to Mr. Burroughs at Casco Bay and Salem Village, and a considerate survey and scrutiny of all that has reached us from the day of his arrest to the moment of his death,

have left a decided impression that he was an able, intelligent, true-minded man; ingenuous, sincere, humble in his spirit; faithful and devoted as a minister; and active, generous, and disinterested as a citizen. His descendants, under his own name and the names of Newman, Fowle, Holbrook, Fox, Thomas, and others, have been numerous and respectable" (Ibid, pp. 303, 304).

Speaking of his execution, he says, quoting a paragraph from Calef: "As soon as he was turned off, Mr. Cotton Mather, being mounted upon a horse, addressed himself to the people, partly to declare that he (Mr. Burroughs) was no ordained minister, and partly to possess the people of his guilt, saying that the devil often had been transformed into an angel of light: and this somewhat appeased the people, and the executions went on. When he was cut down, he was dragged by a halter to a hole, or grave, between the rocks, about two feet deep; his shirt and breeches being pulled off, and an old pair of trousers of one executed put on his lower parts: he was so put in, together with Willard and Carrier, that one of his hands, and his chin, and a foot of one of them, was left uncovered."

"Cotton Mather, not satisfied with this display of animosity, at a moment when every human heart, however embittered by prejudice, is hushed for the time in solemn silence, attempts, in an account afterwards given of Mr. Burrough's trial, to blacken his character by an elaborate dressing-up of the absurd stories told by the accusers, and a perverse misrepresentation of the demeanor of the accused. He relates with apparent glee what was regarded as a wonderful achievement of adroitness on the part of Chief-justice Stoughton in trapping Mr. Burroughs, and putting the laugh upon him in court" (Ibid, p. 301).

On the case of John Proctor, and George Jacobs, Sr., Mr. Upham uses this language: "John Proctor had spoken so boldly against the proceedings, and all who had part in them, that it was felt to be necessary to put him out of the way. He had denounced the entire company of the accusers, and their

revenge demanded his sacrifice. They brought the whole power of their cunning and audacious arts to bear against him, and pursued him to the death with violence and rage. The manly and noble deportment exhibited in his dying hour seems to have made a deep impression on the minds of some, and gave an effectual blow to the delusion. The descendants of John Proctor have always understood that his remains were recovered from the spot where the hangman deposited them, and placed in his own grounds, where they rest to-day.

"No account has come to us of the deportment of George Jacobs, Sr., at his execution. As he was remarkable in life for the firmness of his mind, so he probably was in death. He had made his will before the delusion arose. It is dated January 29, 1692; and shows that he, like Proctor, had a considerable estate. Bartholomew Gedney is one of the attesting witnesses, and probably wrote the document. After his conviction, on the twelfth of August, he caused another to be written, which, in its provisions, reflects light upon the state of mind produced by the condition in which he found himself. In his infirm old age, he had been condemned to die for a crime of which he knew himself innocent, and which there is some reason to believe he did not think any one capable of committing. He regarded the whole thing as a wicked conspiracy and absurd fabrication. He had to end his long life upon a scaffold in a week from that day. His house was desolated and his property sequestered. His only son, charged with the same crime, had eluded the sheriff—leaving his family, in the hurry of his flight, unprovided for—and was an exile in foreign lands. The crazy wife of that son was in prison and in chains, waiting trial on the same charge: her little children, including an unweaned infant, left in a deserted and destitute condition in the woods. The older children were scattered, he knew not where, while one of them had completed the bitterness of his lot by becoming a confessor, upon being arrested with her mother as a witch. This granddaughter, Margaret, overwhelmed with fright and horror, bewildered by the statements of the accusers, and controlled probably by

the arguments and arbitrary methods of address employed by her minister, Mr. Noyes—whose peculiar function in these proceedings seems to have been to drive persons accused to make confession—had been betrayed into that position, and became a confessor, and accuser of others" (Ibid, 312, 315, 316).

Here is another quotation from Upham: "On the ninth of September, the Court met again; and *Martha Corey*, *Mary Easty*, *Alice Parker*, *Ann Pudeator*, Dorcas Hoar, and Mary Bradbury were tried and condemned; and, on the seventeenth *Margaret Scott*, *Wilmot Reed*, *Samuel Wardwell*, *Mary Parker*, Abigail Faulkner, Rebecca Eames, Mary Lacy, Ann Foster, and Abigail Hobbs received the same sentence. Those in italics were executed September 22, 1692" (Ibid, 324).

Respecting the closing of this mad business Upham thus remarks: "After the executions, on the twenty-second of September, the court adjourned to meet some weeks subsequently; and it was, no doubt, their expectation to continue from month to month to hold sessions, and supply, each time, new cart-loads of victims to the hangman. But a sudden collapse took place in the machinery, and they met no more. The executive authority intervened, and their functions ceased. The curtain fell unexpectedly, and the tragedy ended. It is not known precisely what caused this sudden change. It is probable that a revolution had been going on some time in the public mind, which was kept for a while from notice, but at last became too apparent and too serious to be disregarded. It has generally been attributed to the fact that the girls became over-confident, and struck too high. They had ventured, as we have seen, to cry out against the Rev. Samuel Willard, but were rebuked and silenced by the court. Whoever began to waver in his confidence of the correctness of the proceedings was in danger of being attacked by them; and as a general thing, when a person was 'cried out upon,' it may be taken as proof that he had spoken against them" (Ibid, pp. 344, 345).

Of the sad fate of Margaret Jacobs our author observes:

"Margaret Jacobs had to remain in jail after the governor's proclamation had directed the release of all prisoners, because she could not pay the fees and charges. Her grandfather had been executed, and all his furniture, stock, and movable property seized by the marshal or sheriff. Her father escaped the warrant by a sudden flight from his home under the cover of midnight, and was in exile 'beyond the seas:' her mother and herself taken at the time by the officers serving the warrants against them; the younger children of the family, left without protection, had dispersed, and been thrown upon the charity of neighbors; the house had been stripped of its contents, left open, and deserted. She had not a shilling in the world, and knew not where to look for aid. She was taken back to prison, and remained there for some time, until a person named Gammon, apparently a stranger, happened to hear of her case, and, touched with compassion, raised the money required, and released her" (Ibid, pp. 353, 354).

Of Cotton Mather, more is required to be said: "He aspired to be considered the leading champion of the Church, and the most successful combatant against the Satanic powers. He seems to have longed for an opportunity to signalize himself in this particular kind of warfare; seized upon every occurrence that would admit of such a coloring to represent it as the result of diabolical agency; circulated in his numerous publications as many tales of witchcraft as he could collect throughout New and Old England, and repeatedly endeavored to get up cases of the kind in Boston. There is some ground for suspicion that he was instrumental in originating the fanaticism in Salem; at any rate, he took a leading part in fomenting it. And while there is evidence that he endeavored, after the delusion subsided, to escape the disgrace of having approved of the proceedings, and pretended to have been in some measure opposed to them, it can be too clearly shown that he was secretly and cunningly endeavoring to renew them during the next year in his own parish in Boston.

"How blind is man to the future! The state of things which Cotton Mather labored to bring about, in order that he might increase his own influence over an infatuated people by being regarded by them as mighty to cast out and vanquish evil spirits, and as able to hold Satan himself in chains by his prayers and his piety, brought him at length into such disgrace that his power was broken down, and he became the object of public ridicule and open insult. And the excitement that had been produced for the purpose of restoring and strengthening the influence of the clerical and spiritual leaders resulted in effects which reduced that influence to a still lower point. The intimate connection of Dr. Mather and other prominent ministers with the witchcraft delusion brought a reproach upon the clergy from which they have not yet recovered."

"Of the history of Cotton Mather, subsequently to the witchcraft prosecutions, and more or less in consequence of his agency in them, it may be said that the residue of his life was doomed to disappointment, and embittered by reproach and defeat. The storm of fanatical delusion, which he doubted not would carry him to the heights of clerical and spiritual power, in America and everywhere, had left him a wreck. His political aspirations, always one of his strongest passions, were wholly blasted; and the great aim and crown of his ambition, the presidency of Harvard College, once and again and forever had eluded his grasp" (Ibid, pp. 366–369, 503). It is indeed a pity that a man of his abilities and opportunities for good should be stranded on such a miserable, delusive shoal.

Of the Rev. Samuel Parris and his connection with the witch trials, Upham speaks thus: "At this point, if Mr. Parris, the ministers, and magistrates had done their duty, the mischief might have been stopped. The girls ought to have been rebuked for their dangerous and forbidden sorceries and divinations, their meetings broken up, and all such tamperings with alleged supernaturalism and spiritualism frowned down. Instead of this, the neighboring ministers

were summoned to meet at Mr. Parris' house to witness the extraordinary doings of the girls, and all they did was to indorse and pray over them. Countenance was thus given to their pretensions, and the public confidence in the reality of their statements established. Magistrates from the town, church members, leading people, and people of all sorts, flocked to witness the awful power of Satan, as displayed in the tortures and contortions of the 'afflicted children;' who became objects of wonder, so far as their feats were regarded and of pity in view of their agonies and convulsions.

The aspect of the evidence rather favors the supposition, that the girls originally had no design of accusing, or bringing injury upon, any one. But the ministers at Parris' house, physicians and others, began the work of destruction by pronouncing the opinion that they were bewitched. This carried with it, according to the received doctrine, a conviction that there were witches about; for the devil could not act except through the instrumentality of beings in confederacy with him. Immediately, the girls were beset by everybody to say who it was that bewitched them. Yielding to this pressure, they first cried out upon such persons as might have been most naturally suggested to them" (387, 388).

In allusion to Parris' status after the excitement had subsided, he speaks thus: "After the explosion of the witchcraft delusion, the relations of parties became entirely changed. The prosecutors at the trials were put on the defensive, and felt themselves in peril. Parris saw his danger, and, with characteristic courage and fertility of resources, prepared to defend himself, and carry the war upon any quarter from which an attack might be apprehended. He continued, on his own responsibility, to prosecute, in court, his suit against the parish, and in his usual trenchant style. As the law then was, a minister, in a controversy with his parish, had a secure advantage, and absolutely commanded the situation, if his church were with him. From the time of his settlement, Parris had shaped his policy on this basis."

"It is difficult to describe the character of this unfortunate

man. Just as is the condemnation which facts compel history to pronounce, I have a feeling of relief in the thought that, before the tribunal to which he so long ago passed, the mercy we all shall need, which comprehends all motives and allows for all infirmities, has been extended to him, in its infinite wisdom and benignity."

As a rule, every excitement and delusion that runs rapidly soon runs out, and the rule held good in the matter of the Salem witchcraft. The good sense of the public compelled a rational view to be taken, and the imposition that had been played by interested parties was made apparent. The supernatural part of the delusion lost caste and the devil retired far to the rear. It was quite perceptible that the girls had been partly infatuated and partly designing and that they had not been a little influenced by interested clergymen and others who had certain objects to carry out. The truth gradually dawned upon the minds of the masses that the parties who had been arrested, imprisoned, and executed were not the guilty parties, but that the real guilt rested in another quarter—upon the girls and their abettors.

The two clergymen most interested thus fell into disgrace with the people. Cotton Mather, who was so intimately connected with the trials, never reached the goal of his ambition that he hoped for, and the latter part of his life was passed in comparative disgrace.

Parris, who had acted a still more despicable part and had evinced a decided spirit of cruel persecution, was compelled to leave for other parts, as has been shown. Yes, all those who had been directly engaged in the disreputable business passed into disgrace and forgetfulness. Upham thus dismisses Parris: "Samuel Parris, after a ministry of seven years, crowded from the very beginning with contention and animosity, and closed in desolation, ruin, and woes unutterable, havoc scattered among his people and the whole country round, was driven from the parish, the blood of the innocent charged upon his head, and, for the rest of his days, consigned to obscurity and penury. The place of his abode has upon it no

habitation or structure of man; and the only vestiges left of him are his records of the long quarrel with his congregation, and his inscription on the headstone, erected by him, as he left the village forever, over the fresh grave of his wife" (Ibid, p. 515).

Ann Putnam the leading spirit in the strange delusion was truly sorry for the part she had performed in the sad tragedy.

"On the twenty-fifth of August, 1706, a great concourse assembled in the meetinghouse. Large numbers came from other places, particularly from the town of Salem. The following document, having been judged sufficient and suitable, was written out in the church-book the evening before, and signed by her. It was read by the pastor before the congregation, who were seated: she standing in her place while it was read, and owning it as hers by a declaration to that effect at its close, and also acknowledging the signature:

"THE CONFESSION OF ANNE PUTNAM, WHEN SHE WAS RECEIVED TO COMMUNION, 1706.

"I desire to be humbled before God for that sad and humbling providence that befell my father's family in the year about '92; that I, then being in my childhood, should, by such a providence of God, be made an instrument for the accusing of several persons of a grievous crime, whereby their lives were taken away from them, whom now I have just grounds and good reason to believe they were innocent persons; and that it was a great delusion of Satan that deceived me in that sad time, whereby I justly fear I have been instrumental, with others, though ignorantly and unwittingly, to bring upon myself and this land the guilt of innocent blood: though what was said or done by me against any person I can truly and uprightly say, before God and man, I did it not out of any anger, malice, or ill-will to any person, for I had no such thing against one of them; but what I did was ignorantly, being deluded by Satan. And particularly, as I was a chief instrument of accusing of Goodwife Nurse and her two sisters, I desire to lie in the dust, and to be humbled for it, in that I was a cause, with others, of so sad a calamity to them and their families; for which cause I desire to lie in the dust, and earnestly beg forgiveness of God, and from all those unto whom I have given just cause of sorrow and offense, whose relations were taken away or accused. [Signed]

"ANNE PUTNAM."

"This confession was read before the congregation, together with her relation, August 25, 1706; and she acknowledged it."

"While, in a certain sense, she imputes the blame to Satan,

this declaration of Ann Putnam is conclusive evidence that she and her confederate accusers did not believe in any communications having been made to them by invisible spirits of any kind. Those persons, in our day, who imagine that they hold intercourse, by rapping or otherwise, with spiritual beings, have sometimes found arguments in favor of their belief in the phenomena of the witchcraft trials. But Ann Putnam's confession is decisive against this. If she had really received from invisible beings, subordinate spirits, or the spirits of deceased persons, the matters to which she testified, or ever believed that she had, she would have said so. On the contrary she declares that she had no foundation whatever, from any source, for what she said, but was under the subtle and mysterious influence of the devil himself.

"She died at about the age of thirty-six years. Her will is dated May 20, 1715, and was presented in probate June 29, 1716."

Thus passed away the principal actors in that sad drama, during which so much of the spirit of persecution was manifested and such a reign of dark superstition ruled over the minds of otherwise honest people. In the present age of intelligence and scientific investigation, another such wild delusion need never be feared. Where the light of science shines, and the benefits of intelligence and culture abound, little is to be apprehended from the presence of devils and witches. We can well afford to spare the presence of these, together with all the weird and wild and darkening superstitions that attend them, if, instead, we can have reason, science, and nature's truths.

The persecutions which an ignorant belief in witchcraft and the influence of the devil gave birth to, from Christians, show, it is seen, the same intolerance, the same cruelty, and the same sectarian bigotry that they have visited upon every form of heresy and insubordination to their rule and domination. It is to be hoped that the world has seen nearly the last of it.

PROTESTANT PERSECUTIONS.

THE heroic struggle for liberty made for eighty years by the sturdy dwellers in the lowlands of Europe is marred by the persecuting spirit of Christianity, which seems to have converted its believers into fanatics, bent upon the destruction of everything opposed to them. Since the early Christians wandered through the catacombs of Rome, they have been relentless persecutors. From Constantine to the present day they have endeavored, by one means or another, to crush all differences of opinion in matters of faith. Catholics have persecuted Protestants; Protestants have pursued Catholics; Lutherans have hunted Anabaptists; Episcopalians have burned Puritans; Puritans have hanged Quakers; Calvinists have tortured Unitarians, and all have united in persecuting the heroic Infidels who have refused to believe in any of the multifarious and conflicting creeds. If one sect has exceeded another in the number of its victims, it is because its opportunities and power have been greater, and not on account of the absence of the animating spirit of Christianity. Until the religion of humanity shall pervade the world, persecution will never cease. But every struggle for liberty, every search for knowledge, every effort man has made in the past for more freedom and less faith, has placed the world ahead one step; and if it has seemingly relapsed, yet we know by the progress made to-day that it has still gone steadily though slowly onward towards the goal of universal liberty. Religions are dying all around us, but out of their ashes will rise the spirit of brotherhood which shall unlock the shackles of creeds, and unite the people of the earth in a common bond of sympathy and love.

The story of the past is a story of sorrow—sorrow equally for the tyrant and for the victim. The dogma of free will, so tenaciously clung to by the Church, leaves the memory of Christians open only to execration; the more charitable, because truer, law that man is governed by surrounding circumstances covers their crimes with a mantle of pity for the brutality of their time, and leaves a margin of hope that they were better than their creed.

The wildest fanatics are often those who turn from one sect to another. Their zeal exceeds that of those who have been nurtured from infancy in the creed to which the renegades have but recently subscribed, and they are often more cruel persecutors than the party which they have left. Although mortals could hardly have dehumanized themselves in a greater degree than did the Catholics of the sixteenth century, yet the converts to the new religion seem to have striven hard to place themselves side by side with their more orthodox brethren in the ranks of cruelty. The bigotry, intolerance, and heartlessness of Luther and Calvin are a matter of history. The details of their crimes are easily accessible. The records of the Anabaptists teem with their murders. They regarded everybody who dissented from their *ipse dixit* as heretics and children of the devil, and dealt with them accordingly. Andrew Dudith, of Poland, who had been excommunicated from the Romish Church for heresy, gives a clear idea of the spirit which animated these noted reformers, as shown in the following letter to his friend Wolff. He plaintively asks: "Tell me, my learned friend, now that the Calvinists have burnt Servetus, and beheaded Gentilis, and murdered many others, having banished Bernard Ochin with his wife and children from your city in the depth of a sharp winter; now that the Lutherans have expelled Laeso, with the congregation of foreigners that came out of England with him, in an extremely rigorous season of the year; having done a great many such exploits, all contrary to the genius of Christianity [*sic*], how, I ask, how shall we meet the papists? With what face can we tax them with cruelty? How dare we say,

Our weapons are not carnal? How can we any longer urge, Let both grow together till the harvest? Let us cease to boast that faith cannot be compelled, and that conscience ought to be free."

In a letter to Beza, written about the same time, he reads the reformers another severe lesson. He says: "You contend that Scripture is a perfect rule of faith and practice. But you are all divided about the sense of Scripture, and you have not settled who shall be judge. You say one thing, Stancarus another. You quote Scripture, he quotes Scripture. You reason, he reasons. You require me to believe you. I respect you; but why should I trust you rather than Stancarus? You say he is a heretic; but the papists say you are both heretics. Shall I believe them? They quote historians and Fathers; so do you. To whom do you address yourselves? Where is the judge? You say the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets; but you say I am no prophet, and I say, you are not one. Who is to be judge? I love liberty as well as you. You have broken off your yoke; allow me to break mine. Having freed yourselves from the tyranny of popish prelates, why do you turn ecclesiastical tyrants yourselves, and treat others with barbarity and cruelty for only doing what you set them an example to do? You contend that your lay hearers, the magistrates, and not you, are to be blamed, for it is they who banish and burn for heresy. I know you make this excuse; but tell me, have not you instilled such principles into their ears? Have they done anything more than put in practice the doctrine that you taught them? Have you not told them how glorious it was to defend the faith? Have you not been the constant panegyrist of such princes as have depopulated whole districts for heresy? Do you not daily teach that they who appeal from your confessions to Scripture ought to be punished by the secular power? It is impossible for you to deny this. Does not all the world know that you are a set of demagogues, or (to speak more mildly) a sort of tribunes, and that the magistrates do nothing but exhibit in public what you

teach them in private? You try to justify the banishment of Ochin, and the execution of others, and you seem to wish Poland would follow your example. God forbid! When you talk of your Augsburg Confession, and your Helvetic Creed, and your unanimity, and your fundamental truths, I keep thinking of the sixth commandment, Thou shalt not kill" (Eccl. Researches, pp. 592, 593).

"If matters of fact can establish any certainty," says a Christian writer of half a century ago, "then it is certain that the two principal pillars of the Reformation, Martin Luther and John Calvin, and their confederate reformers, were influenced by the self-same spirit of cruelty and injustice which had influenced the ecclesiastical tyrants of every age from Diotrephes and the Alexandrian priesthood down to the same Luther and Calvin."

Lutheranism, as has been seen, spread rapidly in Germany and the provinces of the Netherlands. In the endeavor to suppress it, the Catholics committed the most infernal outrages which lay in their power It remains to be seen whether the Protestants were at all times the submissive saints which their historians would have us believe. "If thine enemy smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the left also," is a trite saying of the itinerant God upon whose defenseless head have been heaped the crimes of eighteen centuries of ecclesiastical rule. Did the followers of the lowly one obey this injunction, or did they seek to find an excuse for their conduct in the equally godlike passage, "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple?" Count the graves of the uncoffined dead scattered through the lowlands of Europe; listen for a moment to the moans that, like a cry of anguish from the heart of the earth, come from Catholic sepulchres of torture, and you have an answer. "By their fruits shall ye know them," is as applicable to Protestants as to fig-trees and bramble-bushes.

In dealing with the Protestant persecutions there is no

desire either to extenuate or exaggerate their crimes. To do either would be to descend to the partisan level of the Catholic or Protestant historian. Sketched in the barest outline they are horrible; stated in detail they would be infamous. They demanded of their foes "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," and to the extent of their power they enforced their demands. One of the first effects of popish misrule in Holland and Zealand was the agreement of the two provinces to protect the exercise of the Reformed religion and suppress the exercise of the Roman faith. The decree was supplemented by the appointment of Diedrich Sonoy as governor of a portion of Holland. He was a man of extreme ferocity of character, and as eager to punish Catholics as the Duke of Alva had been to exterminate Protestants. He organized a tribunal in imitation of Alva's Blood Council, but which, however, was not destined to rival that famous institution Affecting to believe that the Catholics were secretly plotting to aid a Spanish invasion, Sonoy arrested eight persons, whom he doomed to the most horrible tortures, expecting them to implicate persons of higher rank than themselves. As Motley tells the story, "seven, after a few turns of the pulley and the screw, confessed all which they were expected to confess, and accused all whom they were requested to accuse. The eighth was firmer, and refused to testify to the guilt of certain respectable householders, whose names he had, perhaps, never heard, and against whom there was no shadow of evidence. He was, however, reduced by three hours and a half of sharp torture to confess entirely according to their orders, so that accusations and evidence were thus obtained against certain influential gentlemen of the province whose only crime was a secret adherence to the Catholic faith."

These poor wretches were promised unconditional pardon in return for their false evidence, but Sonoy, in violation of his word—which seems never to have been of much value—condemned them to be burned alive. "On their way to the stake they all retracted the statements which had only been

extorted from them by the rack. Nevertheless, the individuals who had been thus designated were arrested, charged with plotting a general conflagration of the villages and farmhouses, in conjunction with an invasion by Hierges and other papist generals: they indignantly protested their innocence; but two of them, a certain Kopp Coneliszoon, and his son, Nanning Koppezoon, were selected to undergo the most cruel torture which had yet been practiced in the Netherlands. Sonoy, to his eternal shame, was disposed to prove that human ingenuity to inflict human misery had not been exhausted in the chambers of the Blood Council, for it was to be shown that reformers were capable of giving a lesson even to inquisitors in this diabolical science. Kopp, a man advanced in years, was tortured during a whole day. On the following morning he was again brought to the rack, but the old man was too weak to endure all the agony which his tormentors had provided for him. Hardly had he been placed upon the bed of torture than he calmly expired, to the great indignation of the tribunal. 'The devil has broken his neck and carried him off to hell,' cried they, ferociously. 'Nevertheless, that shall not prevent him from being hung and quartered.' This decree of impotent vengeance was accordingly executed. The son of Kopp, however, Nanning Koppezoon, was a man in the full vigor of his years. He bore with perfect fortitude a series of incredible tortures, after which, with his body singed from head to heel, and his feet almost entirely flayed, he was left for six weeks to crawl about his dungeon on his knees. He was then brought back to the torture-room, and again stretched upon the rack, while a large earthen vessel, made for the purpose, was placed, inverted, upon his naked body. A number of rats were introduced under this cover, and hot coals were heaped upon the vessel, till the rats, rendered furious by the heat, gnawed into the very bowels of the victim, in their agony to escape. The holes thus torn in his bleeding flesh were filled with red-hot coals. He was afterwards subjected to other tortures too foul to relate; nor was it until he had endured all this agony

with a fortitude which seemed supernatural that he was at last discovered to be human. Scorched, bitten, dislocated in every joint, sleepless, starving, perishing with thirst, he was at last crushed into a false confession by a promise of absolute forgiveness. He admitted everything which was brought to his charge, confessing a catalogue of contemplated burnings and beacon-firings of which he had never dreamed, and avowing himself in league with other desperate papists still more dangerous than himself" (Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic, vol. iii, pp. 29–31).

The Protestant governor showed that he could be as indifferent to his word, when given to a religious foe, as the Catholics, by then sentencing Koppezoon to death. He ordained that "his heart should be torn from his living bosom and thrown into his face, after which his head was to be taken off and exposed on the church steeple of his native village. His body was then to be cut into four pieces, and a quarter fastened upon different towers of the city of Alkamaar" (Ibid).

When led to execution he recanted the false confessions forced from him upon a Protestant rack, whereupon a Protestant pastor, named Jurian Epheszoon, endeavored, by loud praying, to drown his voice. The dying prisoner turned to the clergyman and solemnly assured him that he would not survive three days. "It is a remarkable and authentic fact," says Motley, "that the clergyman thus summoned went home pensively from the place of execution, sickened immediately, and died upon the appointed day." Could all the ministers who had officiated at religious executions have had such righteous retribution meted to them there would have been fewer murders for Christ's sake to stain the leaves of history. If a more horrible persecution was ever perpetrated by Catholics it is not recorded. The rats used on this occasion were furnished by the governor himself. A letter to Sonoy from the commissioners, thanking him for the gift, and detailing in a business-like way the incredible tortures inflicted upon Koppezoon, concludes as follows: "Noble, wise, virtuous,

and very discreet sir, we have wished to apprize you of the foregoing, and we now pray that God Almighty may spare you in a happy, healthy, and long-continued government." Motley characterizes the whole letter as "a wonderful monument of barbarity." It shows, at least, that Protestant commissioners are not less expert in torturing their fellow-beings than Catholic inquisitors. Hundreds of Catholics were tortured by Sonoy's imitation of Alva's Blood Council.

In speaking of the atrocities committed by this Protestant, Menzel, the German historian, says: "The Calvinistic tenets and form of worship were reëstablished, to the exclusion of those of the Catholics and Lutherans. . . . The cruelties practiced by the Catholics were equaled by those inflicted on the opposing party by the reformers. . . . The most horrid atrocities were perpetrated by Sonoy, by whom the few Catholics remaining in Holland were exterminated" (1577). Again: "The citizens of Ghent, with increased insolence, attacked monasteries and churches, committed crucifixes and pictures of the saints to the flames, and burnt six minorites (Catholic friars), accused of favoring the enemy, alive."

Listen to Archbishop Spalding: "Vain were all the efforts of William of Orange to tame the ferocity of the Protestants at Ghent, Bruges, and other cities of the southern provinces. They claimed it as their indefeasible right, and as one of the essential elements of religious liberty according to the new gospel light, to murder Catholic priests on sight, to destroy churches and monasteries, and to forcibly put down Catholic worship."

A Catholic historian (Feller) whose statements, however, must be taken with some allowance on account of the well-known prejudices of Christian writers, estimates that the inhuman monster, William Van der Marck, the predecessor of Sonoy, "killed with unheard-of tortures more peaceful citizens and Catholic priests than the Duke of Alva had executed of rebels in the whole course of his administration." "He

was," says Spalding, "towards the Catholics of Holland, what the ferocious French Huguenot chieftain, D'Adrets, was towards the unfortunate Catholics of France, who fell into his hands during the civil war of that kingdom."

Of the council established by Sonoy, Kerroux, a Protestant historian, candidly says: "It is vain to seek for motives to excuse the proceeding of this horrible board of commissioners, which have left an eternal stain on the Dutch name: and though Sonoy, the principal author of these bloody tragedies, was a stranger, yet the nation which dared not oppose him or punish him for their commission, will never free itself from the reproach of barbarism with which it voluntarily covered itself in the face of all Europe. It is pretended that whatever was then done was only to take away forever from the Catholics all pretext and desire of introducing a change into the government. It was an atrocious means, which no reasons of state could ever justify; no more than it can excuse the unheard-of cruelties perpetrated against people who were entirely innocent of the crimes of which they were accused, the frightful details of which we can not read without a shudder of horror, and without feeling emotions of indignation and hatred."

The image-breaking in the Netherlands, which took place some nine or ten years previous to the appointment of Sonoy as governor, forms an epoch in the history of the Reformed Church. Although it was accomplished with but little loss of life compared with Bartholomew and the Spanish Fury, yet it evinced the same fanatical recklessness and disregard of the rights of opponents which has ever been characteristic of the believers in Christianity. It has been affirmed that a hundred Catholic priests were massacred in Valenciennes in one day. Others, and it may be added, equally as reliable, deny that any person was injured. Let them have the benefit of the imperfect chronicles; the history of our poor race is sad enough without increasing, by even a hundred, the murders committed in the name of religion. But it cannot be denied that an immense and universal destruction of ecclesi-

astical property was effected by the infuriated Calvinists. Dead bodies, even, were dragged from the tomb, where they had lain, embalmed in spices, for years, and thrown upon the floors of the churches, where they were a mark for the blows of the despoilers' weapons, and the object of the bitter, though unheeded, reviling of the mob. Hundreds of churches were sacked and their contents destroyed. Altars were overthrown, the golden candlesticks stolen, images were pulled down and smashed, pictures were taken from the walls and trampled under foot, shrines were desecrated, missals and sacred manuscripts burned, and every thing possible was done to obliterate the last vestige of popish worship in the cities. The church of Notre Dame at Antwerp was the work of centuries. All that the ingenuity of man could devise, his wealth buy, or his daring secure, had been brought and woven into this vast temple of idolatry. Its length was equaled by the height of its spire, which rose to an altitude of five hundred feet. The building dates from 1124, and hundreds of years and millions of dollars had been wasted in its construction. It was a grand old edifice erected for the worship of a grander myth. It was an earthly substitute for the heavenly home, and served to impress the masses with the awful solemnity of the Christian religion and the power of the priests. But as all things, even religions and religious structures must perish, so this magnificent monument was doomed. A few hours' work by the angry crowd destroyed the labor of centuries. Attacking it on all sides with sledge-hammer, axe, and bludgeon, the work of desolation once began was not stayed until the building was a mass of ruins. Long ladders were brought into requisition to reach the elevated ornaments, and clambering over cornice and statue, shrieking like a band of apes, these furious Calvinists annihilated this stupendous altar of superstition. Three nights and two days long did the havoc rage unchecked through the city of Antwerp and the neighboring villages. Scarcely a work of art escaped destruction. It was as though a tornado had swept over the country leveling all before it. On every hand were the ruins

of churches, broken statues, torn pictures, and murdered priests. The process was simultaneous and almost universal. It is difficult to say where it began and where it ended. The number of churches ruined has never been counted. In Flanders alone, four hundred were sacked. In Mechlin the work was accomplished very thoroughly. In Ghent, Tournay, and Antwerp the churches were all destroyed. In Anchin the despoilers were defeated, but in Valenciennes they devastated everything.

"During the summer of 1581," says Motley, "the same spirit of persecution which had inspired the Catholics to inflict such infinite misery upon those of the Reformed faith in the Netherlands began to manifest itself in overt acts against the Papists by those who had at last obtained political ascendency over them. Edicts were published in Antwerp, in Utrecht, and in different cities of Holland, suspending the exercise of the Roman worship."

Calvinism was established as the compulsory religion of the government in Holland, and a terrible war of persecution waged against all dissenters, Catholic and Protestant alike. Says Archbishop Spalding: "All readers of history have learned of the fearful contest between the Gomarists and the Arminians, and know how very bitterly the former persecuted the latter, because, exercising their conceded right of private judgment, these could not see the doctrine of predestination in the same strong Calvinistic light as their more clear-sighted Protestant brethren. The Protestant Arminians were put down, and were not only strongly denounced, but condemned to the most severe punishment by the famous Calvinistic Synod of Dort, held in 1619. This synod was attended by delegates from the Calvinistic churches of Geneva, the Palatinate, and Scotland, besides two Anglican bishops sent out by James I. The assembled ministers condemned the leading Arminians—including such men as Grotius, Vorstius, Hagerbets, and Barneveldt—and not merely their doctrines, but their persons. Grotius and Hagerbets were sentenced to imprisonment for life: and seven hundred

families of Arminians were driven into exile and reduced to beggary." Grotius escaped, but Barneveldt was arrested and afterwards beheaded. Brandt, a Protestant historian, in his History of the Reformation in Holland, gives a detailed account of the terrible persecution of their brother Protestants by the Calvinists of Holland.

The persecution of the Anabaptists by the "Reformed" Church is another dark stain upon the character of the Reformation. They were not the best of men, to be sure, being polygamists, but no mere belief ever deserved torture. They had one redeeming trait, however—the rejection of Lutheranism and the authority of Luther. This was their chief crime, although their rejection of infant baptism, and their protest against any other form of baptism but by immersion, was an argument which weighed heavily against them with the Lutherans, and one to be suitably answered only by extermination. A little before the diet at Augsburg, in 1534, Rothmann, one of their principal prophets, had openly announced his seditious opinions in the streets of that city. By his eloquence and the novelty of his doctrine he succeeded in captivating the people, who cried out to his opponents in triumph, "Answer Rothmann. Catholics, Lutherans, Zuinglians!" But did Luther or Melancthon answer him? Not they. At Worms, but a few years before, Luther had been the heretic; now it was Rothmann. Luther was now a humble imitator of the pope. He kept the Anabaptists out of the diet, and then wrote to Melancthon from Coburg, "That all was decided—the doctrine of Zuingli and of Rothmann was diabolical, and that these sowers of discord, these ravenous wolves, who devastated the fold of Christ, should be banished." The consistency of Luther is further shown by his demanding, at this same diet, not only liberty of conscience, but churches to worship in, and the full rights of citizenship.

But Luther did not stop here. On the seventh of August, 1536, a synod was convened at Hamburg to devise the best means of exterminating the Anabaptists. The meeting was

attended by delegates from all the cities who had renounced Catholicism, and from whom a little toleration might reasonably have been expected. Do we find it? Was the Reformed religion reformed? Had the spirit of persecution gone from the Protestants, and the spirit of toleration taken its place? Was the clemency of Luther greater than the mercy of the pope? Had liberty at last found a resting-place for her weary feet? Let history answer. Not one voice among all the delegates was raised in favor of the Anabaptists. Even Melancthon voted to put all those to death who should remain obstinate in their errors, or who should dare return from the place of banishment to which the magistrates might transport them. "The ministers of Ulm demanded that heresy should be extinguished by fire and sword. Those of Augsburg said: 'If we have not yet sent any Anabaptists to the gibbet, we have at least branded their cheeks with red iron!' Those of Tubingen cried out, 'Mercy for the poor Anabaptists who are seduced by their leaders, but death to the ministers of this sect.' The chancellor showed himself much more tolerant: he wished that the Anabaptists should be imprisoned, *where, by dint of hard usage, they might be converted*" (Catrou, ut supra liv. i, p. 224; Audin, p. 464).

From this exceedingly tolerant council emanated the following exceedingly liberal decree. It reads like an extract from the famous placards of Charles V., and shows exactly to what extent the spirit of liberty animated the Protestant Luther and his followers. It was officially proclaimed that "Whoever rejects infant baptism; whoever transgresses the orders of the magistrates: whoever preaches against taxes; whoever teaches the community of goods; whoever usurps the priesthood; whoever holds unlawful assemblies; whoever sins against faith, *shall be punished with death.* . . . As for the simple people, who have not preached or administered baptism, but who were seduced to permit themselves to frequent the assemblies of the heretics, if they do not wish to renounce Anabaptism, they shall be scourged, punished with perpetual exile, and even with death if they return three

times to the place whence they have been expelled." (See Catrou, Gastius, Menzel, and Meshovius.)

The "simple people" ought to have been extremely grateful for the mildness of the decree which only scourged and perpetually exiled them, while the ministers were indiscriminately condemned to death. But as even "simple people" were killed for returning three times to the place of their birth, they had the glorious privilege, should they desire, of accompanying their favorite minister to the arms of Christ.

The toleration of Lutheranism is duly set forth in this letter from Luther to Philip, the pious landgrave of Hesse, dated from Wittenberg, the Monday after Pentecost of the same year: "Whoever denies the doctrines of our faith—aye, even one article which rests on the Scripture, on the authority of the universal teaching of the Church must be treated not only as a heretic, but also as a blasphemer of the holy name of God. It is not necessary to lose time in disputes with such people; they are to be condemned as impious blasphemers."

It only needs to have added, "But if any shall presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathematized," to complete its likeness to a papal bull. Luther never got over his monkish habits. Had he been elected pope, the Reformation, so far as he was concerned, would have died still-born.

In this same letter, speaking of a man who was so outrageously immoral as to deny the "doctrine of our faith," he piously says: "Drive him away as an apostle of hell; and if he does not flee, deliver him up as a seditious man to the executioner."

Mosheim in speaking of the bitterness and animosity of the refugees from the Catholic Church, says: "Luther himself appears at the head of this sanguinary tribe, whom he far surpassed in invectives and abuse, treating his adversaries with the most brutal asperity, and sparing neither rank or condition." Maclane accuses him of having an "obstinate, stubborn, and violent temper." Dr. Robertson, the historian, says that "this confidence that his own opinions were well-

founded approached to arrogance; his courage in asserting them to rashness; his firmness in adhering to them to obstinacy; and his zeal in confuting his adversaries to rage and scurrility." We gather from Robinson's "Ecclesiastical Researches," whose quaintness is shown by their direct truthfulness, that "There was a Thomas Munzer, who had been a minister at several places, having been persecuted by Luther, and driven to seek refuge where he could. There was Nicholas Stork, Mark Stubner, Martin Cellarius, and others. Against all of them Luther set himself. When he heard of their settling anywhere, he officiously played the part of an universal bishop, and wrote to princes and senates to expel such dangerous men." The book continues: "This same Luther, who under the hypocritical mask of a minister of Christ, exhorted the oppressed peasants not to resist evil, wrote again to the princes and endeavored to convince them that it was their duty to kill and exterminate these same peasants as they would mad dogs." "It is true," says Mosheim, "that many Anabaptists suffered death merely because they were judged to be incurable heretics, for in this century the error of limiting the administration of baptism to adult persons only, and the practice of re-baptizing such as had received that sacrament in a state of infancy were looked upon as most flagitious and intolerable heresies."

The other "reformers" also were not laggards in showing their irrepressible yearning for liberty of conscience. D'Aubigné, himself a most partisan Protestant, admits that at Zurich fourteen men and seven women "were imprisoned on an allowance of bread and water in the heretics' tower." The Protestants of Switzerland inclosed the poor Anabaptists in sacks and threw them into the Rhine, remarking in a playful manner "That they were merely baptizing them by their own favorite mode of immersion" (Menzel).

The Calvinists emulated the zeal of the Lutherans, and were as tolerant as the adherents of the German monk. They called Lutherans sons of the devil, and drove them out of southern Germany, in a portion of which the Calvinists had

gained the ascendency. "More than a thousand Lutheran ministers," says Olearius, "were proscribed, with their wives and children, and reduced to beg the bread of charity." In Switzerland, also, the laws enacted under the vigilant eye of Calvin were exceedingly tolerant—so much so, that through their beneficent operation several thousand people were imprisoned, exiled, or killed. From Audin, the following facts are gleaned: The lady who arranged her hair coquettishly was to be imprisoned, as also her chambermaid; the merchant who played at cards was confined in a jail, as well as the peasant who spoke too harshly to his beast, and the citizen who did not blow out his candle at the precise moment designated by law; men were forbidden to dance with women, wear figured hose or flowered breeches; no one was to have in his possession a cross or any other badge of popery: he who sold wafers was fined and his stock burned as sacrilegious. A man who dared to keep his hat on at the approach of Calvin was fined: he that contradicted him was arraigned before the consistory and threatened with excommunication. A man who danced on his wedding-day was imprisoned for three days. Everybody was ordered to eat meat on Friday, to spite the Catholics, under penalty of imprisonment for three days. A man was kept in prison four days because he insisted on his child bearing the name chosen by himself instead of the one preferred by the minister. A man who smiled at seeing another man fall from his chair at a meeting where Calvin was preaching was fined and imprisoned four days.

During Calvin's reign in the cantons of Switzerland, Peter Ameaux was condemned to pass through the streets of Geneva in his shirt, a torch in his hand, his head and feet bare, and obliged to ask pardon for having said that "Calvin was a wicked man, announcing false doctrine;" Henry de la Marc was exiled for having said that he always considered Peter Ameaux "a peaceable and worthy man, but that when Calvin had a spite against any one he was never satisfied;" Francis Favre was imprisoned, with his daughter, son-in-law;

and friends, for having danced; Jerome Bolsec was exiled for having "proposed an opinion false and contrary to the Evangelical religion;" Gruet was beheaded and his head nailed to a post because he was suspected of being the author of a placard against Abel Poupin, and because letters ridiculing Calvin were found in his house: Servetus was accused of being the sower of heresies, arrested, thrown into prison, where he remained two months, eaten with vermin, almost naked, and with but little food, and whence he was taken and burned at the stake, suffering the most horrible agony.

The toleration, which of course exists, is not observable to ordinary minds, although to a Presbyterian it may be perfectly apparent.

One of the most influential Calvinists of the sixteenth century was Baron D'Adrets, a Huguenot chieftain who figured extensively in the wars waged between that branch of Christians and the Catholics. He joined the Huguenots in 1562, out of hatred to the Duke of Guise. Archbishop Spalding, who gives three authorities for his statements, says of him: "His career was signalized by the celerity and success of his movements, but still more by the horrid sufferings which he inflicted upon the Catholic party. He took successively Valence, Vienne, Grenoble, and Lyons: and he everywhere raged like a wild beast against conquered foes. He burned, sacked, and slaughtered with a ferocity which excited the disgust of even his own more humane officers. His very appearance was so ferocious as to strike terror into the most stout-hearted. After having taken the strong fortresses of Mornas and Montbrison, it was his favorite amusement after dinner to see his Catholic prisoners leap from the battlements into the surrounding moats, where their bodies were received on the upraised pikes of his soldiers. 'He was, in regard to the Catholics, what Nero had been in regard to the early Christians.' He sought out and invented the most novel punishments, which he took pleasure in seeing inflicted on those who fell into his hands. This monster, wishing to make his children as cruel as himself, forced them to bathe in the blood

of the Catholics whom he had butchered; and these barbarities met with the approbation of the chief of the party."

The honor and toleration of John Calvin can be readily seen from the following incident and letter: Calvin had an admirer at Geneva whose name was Trie. This Trie had a relation at Lyons, a papist, whose name was Arney, who incessantly exhorted his cousin Trie to return to the bosom of the Church. Calvin dictated letters in the name of William Trie, who directed them to Arney, and Arney carried them to Ory the inquisitor. By which means, in the year 1553, Servetus was seized and cast into prison. One of the letters to Arney, under the name of Trie, reads: "I thank God, that vices are better corrected here than among all your officials. With you they support a heretic, who deserves to be burnt wherever he is found. When I mention to you a heretic, I mention one who shall be condemned by the papists as well as by us, at least he deserves to be so; for although we differ in opinion about many things, we are still agreed that there are three persons in one essence of God. You cruelly burn us; but behold him, who shall call Jesus Christ an idol, who shall destroy all the foundations of faith, who gathers all the dreams of ancient heretics, who shall even condemn the baptism of little children, calling it a diabolical invention; and he shall have the vogue amongst you, and be supported as if he had committed no fault. Where, pray, is the zeal you pretend to? And where is the wisdom of this fine hierarchy you magnify so much?" (Robinson's Eccl. Researches, p. 336.)

"Many," says Robinson, "have pretended to apologize for Calvin, but what are his nostrums, which end in tyranny and murder, that the great voice of nature should be drowned in the din of a vain babbling about him?' Calvin's heart never relented at the recollection of his many crimes—the burning of Servetus, the beheading of James Gruet, the banishment of Castalio and Bolsec, and the thousands of other persecutions perpetrated in his theocracy. On the contrary, his pious soul gloried in his work for God, and he

sought to justify his damnable actions by publishing "A faithful account of the errors of Michael Servetus, in which it is proved that heretics ought to be restrained with the sword." Castellio or Socinus answered the book, whereupon Beza and a host of minor writers proved by the Bible—"Scripture texts and godly words"—that killing heretics was a divine command, and claimed a special interposition of providence in the case of Servetus. Melancthon, who has been called the mildest and most moderate of the early reformers, heartily approved of the burning of Servetus, which naturally suggests the inquiry: If the mildest-mannered men in the reformed party approved of burning, to what extremities would not the passionate ones proceed?

The persecuting spirit of Calvin was not confined to Geneva. It leaped like a blighting curse to Poland, to Scotland, to France. Says Robinson: "Calvin and other foreign divines had many tools in Poland, particularly Prasnicius, a violent orthodox clergyman. With this man, and through him with the nobility, gentry, and clergy, Calvin and Beza corresponded; and many divines of Germany and Switzerland, and even the synod of Geneva, sent letters and tracts into Poland, all justifying the murder of Gentilis and Servetus, and the necessity of employing the secular power to rid the world of such monsters as denied the trinity and infant baptism." The consistory of Geneva advised Prince Radzivil "to use his influence with the nobility of Poland, to engage them to treat the Antitrinitarians as they would Tartars and Muscovites."

A young law student, in a letter to D'Aubigné makes these pertinent reflections upon the founders of the Protestant faith: "But was Protestantism established by a saint? Luther, Calvin, Henry VIII., are they saints? yes or no. If they are, prove it. If not, your religion is not holy, and a religion that is not holy is not true; for a true religion is that which comes from God, and that which comes from God is holy by its very nature.

"No! I say that the founders of Protestantism were not

saints, and history proves the fact. No, Luther was not a saint, because he made converts by the sword and animal force, not by persuasion and logic; because it was upon the smoking ruins of seven cities, one thousand monasteries, three hundred churches, that he established his religion; because he shed torrents of blood merely to satiate his ambition, and excited princes to war, saying, 'As long as there will rest a drop of blood in your veins, pursue as wild beasts, and consume like wolves these miserable peasants;' because he violated the most sacred principles of morals by permitting bigamy; because his morals were so corrupt that even Calvin was compelled to say: 'Surely, Luther is very wicked. Would to God that he would take more pains to curb the intemperance which consumes him; would to God that he would think more of acknowledging his own vices!'

"No, Calvin was no saint, because he tyrannized over both body and soul, because he wrote his laws with human blood, and ruled by the assistance of butchers and instruments of torture; because he was the persecutor of Peter Ameaux, of Henry de la Marc, of Francis Favre, of Jerome Bolsec; because he was the assassin of Gruet, and of Servetus; because his theological system, according to a Protestant minister, is 'the most horrible ever conceived by any human being.'

"No, Henry VIII. was no saint, because he possessed the most corrupt heart, the most degraded and debased character perhaps of his time; because he outraged the consciences of his subjects, by the bill of the Six Articles, in forcing them to believe under pain of imprisonment or death what he desired; because he dyed his hands in the blood of Fisher and Thomas More; because he violated five different times his marriage vows; because he was the assassin of Anne Boleyn and Catherine Howard, his wives; and because he was a monster of cruelty, of debauchery, and of intemperance" (Spalding's Hist. Prot. Ref., vol. i, pp. 509, 510).

There is an article in the Presbyterian confession of faith, a solemn injunction to "remove all false worship and all

monuments of idolatry." That injunction was John Knox's sheet anchor in his work in Scotland. On the eleventh of May, 1559, Knox, who remained at Perth, preached a sermon in which he exposed the idolatry of the mass and of image-worship. After the sermon a boy and a priest became engaged in a heated religious dispute in the course of which the priest used the argument usually employed and knocked the boy down. The boy retaliated by throwing a stone at the priest, which, falling on the altar, broke a graven image. This was a signal for the zealous reformers, who were not slow to seize it. In the course of a few minutes the church was in ruins—the images, altars, and ornaments torn down and trampled under foot. Not satisfied, however, with this, the mob flew upon the monasteries, nor was their wrath appeased until the houses of the grey and black friars, with the costly edifice of the Carthusian monks, were laid in ruins. Knox and his followers also despoiled the churches and razed the monasteries in St. Andrews, Crail, Cupar, Lindores, Stirling, Linlithgow, and at Edinburgh. Speaking of the demolition of the Abbey of Kelso, which was accomplished by the reformers in 1569, Hutchinson, a Protestant writer, energetically says: "This abbey was demolished in consequence of the enthusiastic Reformation, which in its violence was a greater disgrace to religion than all the errors it was intended to subvert. Reformation has hitherto always appeared in the form of a zealot, full of fanatic fury, with violence subduing, but through madness creating almost as many mischiefs in its oversights as it overthrows errors in its pursuits. Religion has received a greater shock from the present struggle to suppress some formularies and save some scruples than it ever did by the growth of superstition" (Hist. Northumberland, vol. i. p. 265).

In Scotland the clergy organized themselves into legislative bodies and enacted laws for the government of the people. Refusal to obey them was punished with severity. Speaking of Scotland in the seventeenth century, Buckle says: "The arbitrary and irresponsible tribunals which now

sprung up all over Scotland united the executive authority with the legislative, and exercised both functions at the same time. Declaring that certain acts ought not to be committed, they took the law into their own hands and punished those who had committed them. According to the principles of this new jurisprudence, of which the clergy were the authors, it became a sin for any Scotchman to travel in a Catholic country. It was a sin for any Scotch innkeeper to admit a Catholic into his inn. It was a sin for any Scotch town to hold a market either on Saturday or on Monday, because both days were near Sunday. It was a sin for a Scotch woman to wait at a tavern; it was a sin for her to live alone; it was also a sin for her to live with unmarried sisters. It was a sin to go from one town to another on Sunday, however pressing the business might be. It was a sin to visit your friend on Sunday; it was likewise sinful either to have your garden watered or your beard shaved. Such things were not to be tolerated in a Christian land. No one, on Sunday, should pay attention to his health, or think of his body at all. On that day horse exercise was sinful, so was walking in the field, or in the meadows or in the streets, or enjoying the fine weather by sitting at the door of your own house. To go to sleep on Sunday before the duties of the day were over was also sinful and deserved Church censure. Bathing, being pleasant as well as wholesome, was a particularly grievous offense, and no man could be allowed to swim on Sunday" (Hist. of Civilization, vol. ii, pp. 310–312).

"The clergy deprived the people of their holidays, their amusements, their shows, their games, and their sports; they repressed every appearance of joy; they forbade all merriment: they stopped all festivities; they choked up every avenue by which pleasure could enter, and they spread over the country a universal gloom. Then truly did darkness sit upon the land. Men, in their daily actions and in their very looks, became troubled, melancholy, and ascetic. Their countenance soured and was downcast. Not only their opinions but their gait, their demeanor and, their voice, their gen-

eral aspect, were influenced by that deadly blight which nipped all that was genial and warm. The way of life fell into the sere and yellow leaf; its tints gradually deepened; its bloom faded and passed off; its spring, its freshness, and its beauty were gone: joy and love either disappeared or were forced to hide themselves in obscure corners, until at length the fairest and most endearing parts of our nature, being constantly repressed, ceased to bear fruit and seemed to be withered into perpetual sterility" (Ibid, p. 314).

Such is the story of the Reformation in Scotland—the land of smoky whiskey and cast-iron creeds.

The Protestant persecutions in Ireland form a painful chapter in the history of that creed-cursed little isle. The Tudors, the Plantagenets, the Stuarts, all oppressed the people on one pretense or another, while Cromwell, in the name of religion, outdid them all. At the head of his troopers—who were saints as well as soldiers—he carried out Calvin's decree by sacking houses and towns, destroying the churches, and burning women and children. At Drogheda he burned with the church all who had sought refuge within its walls. It is impossible to estimate the number of lives lost and the amount of property destroyed in Ireland. Under Protestant or Catholic rule, that little spot, so fondly called the "Gem of the Sea" by its inhabitants, has been racked and torn, until the life has almost been crushed out of it, and its best and bravest minds are exiles from the land of their birth and love. Ireland is a working model of a priest-governed country, and shows to what depths the Christian religion can sink an otherwise gifted people.

If Protestantism is a religion of toleration, as is so boastingly claimed by its adherents, from Methodists to High Church Episcopalians, it ought to be shown in the laws framed by Protestant monarchs for the government of Ireland. Let us look at those laws given in the plenitude of Protestant power. In one Irish parliament—the second of Elizabeth—"it was enacted that the Irish should be reformed after the model of the English Church: but both the people and the

nobility abhorred the change, and the new statutes were carried into execution in those places only where they could be enforced at the point of the bayonet" (Lingard, Hist. Eng., vol. vii, 125). The toleration which enacted laws in matters of faith that could only be enforced by powder and ball needs leavening with considerable faith to render it apparent.

In McGhee's "History of the Attempt to Establish the Protestant Reformation in Ireland," appears the following paragraph, which illustrates in a graphic manner the means taken to reform the mother Church:

"While the war against the Desmonds was raging in the south, under pretense of suppressing rebellion, no one could help seeing that in reality it was directed against the Catholic religion. If any had doubted the real objects, events which quickly followed Elizabeth's victory soon convinced them. Dermid O'Hurley, archbishop of Cashel, being taken by the victors, was brought to Dublin in 1582. Here the Protestant primate, Loftus, besieged him in vain for nearly a year to deny the pope's supremacy and acknowledge the queen's. Finding him of unshaken faith, he was brought out for martyrdom on Stephen's Green, adjoining the city: there he was tied to a tree, his boots filled with combustibles, and his limbs stripped and smeared with oil and alcohol. Alternately they lighted and quenched the flame which enveloped him, prolonging his torture through four successive days. Still remaining firm, before dawn of the fifth day they finally consumed his last remains of life, and left his calcined bones among the ashes at the foot of his stake. The relics, gathered in secret by some pious friends, were hidden away in the half-ruined church of St. Kevin, near that outlet of Dublin called Kevinsport. In Desmond's town of Kilmallock were then taken Patrick O'Hely, bishop of Mayo, Father Cornelius, a Franciscan, and some others. To extort from them confessions of the new faith, their thighs were broken with hammers, and their arms crushed by levers. They died without yielding, and the instruments of their

torture were buried with them in the Franciscan convent of Askeaton. The Most Rev. Richard Creagh, primate of all Ireland, was the next victim. Failing to convict him in Ireland of the imputed crime of violating a young woman, who herself exposed the calumny, and suffered for so doing, they brought him to London, where he is said to have died of poison on the fourteenth of October, 1585."

While the Protestants were thus forcibly converting Ireland, the English penal statutes were, as a matter of course, extended to the sister kingdom, and they were enforced whenever and wherever it was possible to secure their execution. But other laws, exemplifying in a still higher degree the wonderful magnanimity of the Protestant powers, were passed, and are on the statute books of England and Ireland to this day. Most of them have, of course, been repealed, but some—like our own ancient statute in the District of Columbia against heresy—remain to disgrace the law records of the United Kingdom. They are to be found in Bancroft's "History of the United States" (vol. v, p. 66).

"The Catholic Irish, being disfranchised, one enactment pursued them after another, till they suffered under a universal, unmitigated, indispensable, exceptionless disqualification. In the courts of law, they could not gain a place on the bench, nor act as a barrister, or attorney, or solicitor, nor be employed even as a hired clerk, nor sit on a grand jury, nor serve as a sheriff or a justice of the peace, nor hold even the lowest civil office of trust and profit, nor have any privilege in a town corporate, nor be a freeman of such corporation, nor vote at a vestry. If papists would trade and work, they must do it, even in their native towns, as aliens. They were expressly forbidden to take more than two apprentices in whatever employment, except in the linen manufacture only. A Catholic might not marry a Protestant: the priest who should celebrate such a marriage was to be hanged; nor be a guardian to any child, nor educate his own child, if the mother declared herself a Protestant: or even if his own child, however young, should profess to be a Protestant. None but those

who conformed to the Established Church were admitted to study at the universities, nor could degrees be obtained but by those who had taken all the tests, oaths, and declarations.

"No Protestant in Ireland might instruct a papist. Papists could not supply their wants by academies and schools of their own; for a Catholic to teach, even in a private family or as usher to a Protestant, was a felony, punishable by imprisonment, exile, or death. Thus 'papists' were excluded from all opportunity of education at home, except by stealth and in violation of law. It might be thought that schools abroad were open to them; but, by a statute of King William, to be educated in any foreign Catholic school was an unalterable and perpetual outlawry. The child sent abroad for education, no matter of how tender an age, or himself how innocent, could never after sue in law or equity, or be guardian, executor, or administrator, or receive any legacy or deed of gift; he forfeited all his goods and chattels, and forfeited for his life all his lands. Whoever sent him abroad, or maintained him there, or assisted him with money or otherwise, incurred the same liabilities and penalties. The crown divided the forfeiture with the informer; and when a person was proved to have sent abroad a bill of exchange or money, on him rested the burden of proving that the remittance was innocent, and he must do so before justices, without the benefit of a jury.

"The Irish Catholics were not only deprived of their liberties, but even of the opportunity of worship, except by connivance. Their clergy, taken from the humbler classes of the people, could not be taught at home nor be sent for education beyond seas, nor be recruited by learned ecclesiastics from abroad. Such priests as were permitted to reside in Ireland were required to be registered, and were kept like prisoners at large within prescribed limits. All 'papists' exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, all monks, friars, and regular priests, and all priests not then actually in parishes and to be registered, were banished from Ireland under pain of transportation, and, on a return, of being hanged, drawn,

and quartered. Avarice was stimulated to apprehend them by the promise of a reward; he that should harbor or conceal them was to be stripped of all his property.

"When the registered priests were dead, the law, which was made perpetual, applied to every popish priest. By the laws of William and of Anne, St. Patrick, in Ireland, in the eighteenth century, would have been a felon. Any two justices of the peace might call before them any Catholic, and make inquisition as to when he heard mass, who were present, and what Catholic schoolmaster or priest he knew of; and the penalty for refusal to answer was a fine or a year's imprisonment. The Catholic priest, abjuring his religion, received a pension of thirty, and afterwards of forty, pounds.

"The Catholic Irish had been plundered of six-sevenths of the land by iniquitous confiscations; every acre of the remaining seventh was grudged them by the Protestants. No nonconforming Catholic could buy land, or receive it by descent, devise, or settlement; or lend money on it as the security; or hold an interest in it through a Protestant trustee; or take a lease of ground for more than thirty-one years. If, under such a lease, he brought his farm to produce more than one-third beyond the rent, the first Protestant discoverer might sue for the lease before known Protestants, making the defendant answer all interrogatories on oath; so that the Catholic farmer dared not drain his fields, nor inclose them, nor build solid houses on them. If in any way he improved their productiveness, his lease was forfeited. It was his interest rather to deteriorate the country, lest envy should prompt some one to turn him out of doors. In all these cases the forfeitures were in favor of Protestants. Even if a Catholic owned a horse worth more than five pounds, any Protestant might take it away. Nor was natural affection or parental authority respected.

"The son of a Catholic landholder, however dissolute or however young, if he would but join the English Church, could revolt against his father, and turn his father's estate in fee simple into a tenancy for life, becoming himself the

owner, and annulling every agreement made by the father, even before his son's conversion.

"The dominion of the child over the property of the popish parent was universal. The Catholic father could not in any degree disinherit his apostatizing son; but the child, in declaring himself a Protestant, might compel his father to confess upon oath the value of his substance, real and personal, on which the Protestant court might out of it award the son immediate maintenance, and after the father's death, any establishment it pleased. A new bill might at any time be brought by one or all of the children, for a further discovery. If the parent, by his industry, improved his property, the son might compel a new account of the value of the estate, in order to a new disposition. The father had no security against the persecution of his children but by abandoning all acquisition or improvement."

In an article published in the "Metropolitan Record," for March 12, 1859, is found the following epitome of the foregoing Irish penal laws. A single glance will convince the most skeptical of the toleration shown by the Protestants:

"If a Catholic schoolmaster taught any person, Protestant or Catholic, any species of literature or science, such teacher was, for the crime of teaching, punishable by banishment; and if he returned from banishment he was subject to be hanged as a felon.

"If a Catholic, whether a child or adult, attended in Ireland a school kept by a Catholic, or was privately instructed by a Catholic, such person, although a child in its early infancy, incurred a forfeiture of all its property, present or future.

"If a Catholic child, however young, was sent to any foreign country for education, such infant incurred a similar penalty—that is, a forfeiture of all right to property present or prospective.

"If any person in Ireland made remittance of any money or goods for the maintenance of any Irish child educated in a foreign country, such person incurred similar forfeiture.

"With respect to the Catholic Church, the reforming civilizers enacted:

"To teach the Catholic religion is declared a felony, punished by transportation.

"To be a Catholic, monk, or friar, punishable by banishment, and to return from the banishment an act of high treason, to be punished by death.

"To exercise the functions of a Catholic bishop or archbishop, in Ireland, a transportable offense, and to return from banishment, as such, an act of high treason, punished by being hanged and afterwards quartered by the executioner.

"Domestic happiness, family union, and fraternal love would, it was thought, by Ireland's English rulers, be promoted by a code such as this:

"If a Catholic wife declared herself a Protestant, she was immediately entitled to a separate maintenance and the custody of all the children.

"If the eldest son of a Catholic, no matter of what age, became a Protestant, he at once made his father a tenant for life of his own estate, and such son became absolute master of such estate.

"'If any other child, younger than the eldest son, declared itself a Protestant, it at once became free from all control of the parent.'

"Thus the wife, the heir at law, and all the other children, were, by statute law, openly encouraged to rebel against the husband and father, and violate every principle of a Christian life."

After an acquaintance of about five hundred years, the English government thought that her military, naval, and civil service, both in Ireland and abroad, could be best promoted by legislation, such as the following:

"Catholics were declared incapable of holding any commission in the army or navy, or serving even as private soldiers, unless they abjured that religion.

"Catholics were universally excluded from all offices under the State, and deprived of the right of voting at any election.

"Catholics were excluded from Parliament.

"If any Catholic purchased for money an estate in land, any Protestant may take it from him without paying a farthing of the purchase money.

"Edmund Burke, speaking of the code, said: 'It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man.'"

On reading the foregoing, one is tempted to ask, Is it better or worse? Popery or Protestantism—which? with a decided leaning in favor of neither.

But the persecutions did not stop in Ireland. In Norway the hand of torture had not lost its cunning, and the cold of Iceland failed to prevent Protestants from repaying some of the old-time scores. The bleak fields and icy mountains were rendered drearier by the landing on her shores of superstitious intolerance under the guise of religious liberty. It is admitted that the Reformation was introduced into Iceland by downright violence. The people declared they would not be converted, rallied around a favorite bishop, and with arms in their hands, resisted the efforts of the Protestants to win them from the one true faith. The king of Denmark dispatched a large force to the island, which, by reason of its superior numbers, succeeded in dispersing the Catholic insurgents. The bishop was seized and put to death. The disaffection continuing, it was finally put down by brute force, and Lutheranism firmly established (Spalding, vol. ii, p. 453).

Norway was converted by the same means—a large army freely used. Now no one not belonging to the State Church can hold office in their "reformed" country, neither a Methodist, Catholic, or even a Quaker. The toleration of Protestantism, so far, is not strikingly apparent.

In speaking of the persecutions by Protestants, Lecky says: "In Germany at the time of the protestation of Spires, when the name of Protestant was assumed, the Lutheran princes absolutely prohibited the celebration of mass within

their dominions. In England a similar measure was passed as early as Edward VI. On the accession of Elizabeth, and before the Catholics had given any signs of discontent, a law was made prohibiting any religious service other than the prayer book, the penalty for the third offense being imprisonment for life, while another law imposed a fine on any one who abstained from the Anglican service. The Presbyterians through a long succession of reigns were imprisoned, branded, mutilated, scourged, and exposed in the pillory. Many Catholics under false pretenses were tortured and hung. Anabaptists and Arians were burnt alive. In Ireland the religion of the immense majority of the people was banned and proscribed, and when in 1626 the Government manifested some slight wish to grant it partial relief, nearly all the Irish Protestant bishops under the presidency of Usher assembled to protest, in a solemn resolution, against the indulgence. 'The religion of papists,' they said, 'is superstitious, their faith and doctrine erroneous and heretical, their Church in respect of both, apostatical. To give them, therefore, a toleration, or to consent that they may freely exercise their religion and profess their faith and doctrine, is a grievous sin.' In Scotland, during almost the whole period that the Stuarts were on the throne of England, a persecution rivaling in atrocity almost any on record was directed by the English Government, at the instigation of the Scotch bishops, and with the approbation of the English Church, against all who repudiated Episcopacy. If a conventicle was held in a house, the preacher was liable to be put to death. If it was held in the open air, both minister and people incurred the same fate. The Presbyterians were hunted like criminals over the mountains. Their ears were torn from the roots. They were branded with hot irons. Their fingers were wrenched asunder by the thumbkins. The bones of their legs were shattered in the boots. Women were scourged publicly through the streets. Multitudes were transported to Barbadoes. An infuriated soldiery was let loose upon them and encouraged to exercise all their ingenuity in torturing them. Nor was it only the British

Government or the zealous advocates of Episcopacy who manifested this spirit. When the Reformation triumphed in Scotland, one of its first fruits was a law prohibiting any priest from celebrating or any worshiper from hearing mass, under pain of the confiscation of his goods for the first offense, of exile for the second, and of death for the third. That the queen of Scotland should be permitted to hear mass in her own private chapel was publicly denounced as an intolerable evil. 'One mass,' exclaimed Knox, 'is more fearful to me than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed in any part of the realm.' In France, when the government of certain towns was conceded to the Protestants, they immediately employed their power to suppress absolutely the Catholic worship, to prohibit any Protestant from attending a marriage or a funeral that was celebrated by a priest, to put down all mixed marriages, and to persecute to the full extent of their power those who had abandoned their creed. In Sweden, all who dissented from any article of the Confession of Augsburg were at once banished. In Protestant Switzerland numerous Anabaptists perished by drowning; the Freethinker, Gentilis, by the axe; Servetus and a convert to Judaism, by the flames" (Hist. Rat., vol. ii, pp. 46–9).

Everywhere Protestants believed in persecution. The same author continues: "The right of the civil magistrate to punish heresy was maintained by the Helvetic, Scottish, Belgic, and Saxon confessions. Luther, in reply to Philip of Hesse, distinctly asserted it: Calvin, Beza, and Jurieu all wrote books on the lawfulness of persecution. Knox, appealing to the Old Testament, declared that those who were guilty of idolatry might justly be put to death. Cranmer and Ridley, as well as four other bishops, formed the commission in the reign of Edward VI. for trying Anabaptists: and if we may believe Fox, it was only by the long and earnest solicitation of Cranmer that Edward consented to sign the warrant that consigned Joan Bocher to the flames. The only two exceptions to this spirit among the leaders of the Reformation seem to have been Zuinglius and Socinus. The first was always averse to

persecution. The second was so distinctively the apostle of toleration that this was long regarded as one of the peculiar doctrines of his sect. With these exceptions, all the leading reformers seem to have advocated persecution, and in nearly every country where their boasted Reformation triumphed, the result is to be mainly attributed to coersion."

The persecution of the Quakers by the Protestants form one of the saddest chapters in the volume of ecclesiastical crime. That a quiet, peaceable, honest, inoffensive sect, no matter how strong their delusion, should be subjected to the infernal rule of bigoted Christians is a reproach upon the manhood of the world. and the perpetrators of the outrage cannot be denounced in too strong terms. From Sewel's history of the people called Quakers, a quaint old book, is taken a few of the hellish particulars. After relating many scenes of cruelty which terminated in the death of the sufferers, Sewel says:

"Severe persecution raged not only in London, but all over the kingdom [in 1662] of which a relation was printed of more than four thousand two hundred of those called Quakers, both men and women, that were imprisoned either for frequenting meetings or for refusing to swear. Many of these were grievously beaten, or their clothes torn, or taken away from them; and some were put into such stinking dungeons that some great men said they would not have put their hunting-dogs there. Some prisons were crowded full of both men and women, so that there was not sufficient room for all to sit down at once; and in Cheshire sixty-eight persons were in this manner locked up in a small room. By such ill treatment many grew sick, and not a few died in such jails; for no age or sex was regarded, but even ancient people, of sixty, seventy, and more years of age, were not spared. This year (1676) died in prison John Sage, being about eighty years of age, after having been in prison at Ivelchester, in Somersetshire, almost ten years, for not paying tithes. And it appeared, that since the restoration of King Charles, above two hundred of the people called Quakers

died in prison in England, where they had been confined because of their religion."

The first of those called Quakers who really suffered banishment were Edward Brush and James Harding who were carried to Jamaica. In the fore part of the year 1665, many of the Quakers were sentenced to be transported: and as the sentences of transportation were multiplied in the course of the following summer, the number of those that died of the pestilence very greatly increased. In consequence of those cruel sentences, fifty-five Quakers, eighteen of whom were women, were put on board one ship: but before they were able to proceed on their voyage the plague so increased that many died on board the ship: and according to the bills of mortality, in the beginning of August, while the ship was yet in port, upwards of three thousand died in one week in the city of London. Notwithstanding, the number of deaths still increased, and the pestilence raged to such an extent that in the latter end of September nearly eight thousand people died in London in one week, and the grass grew in the most populous streets of the city; yet the Quakers' meetings were still disturbed, and sentences of transportation still continued.

According to the laws of the realm, the penalty for attending any conventicle or religious meeting, separate from the established worship, was three months' imprisonment or five pounds for the first offense, and ten pounds or six months' imprisonment for the second, and banishment beyond the seas for seven years for the third offense, or one hundred pounds for a discharge, and the additional sum of one hundred pounds more for every new offense committed. And in case that any one, being condemned to banishment, should escape or return within the time prescribed, he should suffer death and forfeit all his goods and chattels forever. Under this worse than savage system many were fleeced of their whole estates, while the malicious priests exercised their utmost vigilance to detect the innocent and inflame the civil powers, with whom they shared the spoil.

It would be endless to enumerate the sums unjustly and cruelly extorted from the harmless Quakers by those greedy dogs. "Among others," says Sewel, "one Henry Marshall, having several benefices—yet how great soever his revenues were—kept poor people of that persuasion in prison for not paying tithes to him; and once he said, from the pulpit, that not one Quaker should be left alive in England." And the bishop of Peterborough said publicly: "When the parliament sits again, a stronger law will be made, not only to take away their lands and goods, but also to sell them for bond slaves."

Thus the churchmen blew the fires of persecution, and kindled so high a flame in the breasts of unmerciful statesmen that Justice Penniston Whaley, who had fined many of those called Quakers for attending their religious meetings, encouraged the people at the sessions to persecute the Quakers without pity, saying, "Harden your hearts against them, for the act of the thirty-fifth of Queen Elizabeth is not made against the papists, since the Church of Rome is a true church, as well as any other church; but the Quakers are erroneous and seditious persons."

And again, at the trial of William Penn, the recorder of the court ventured to say, "Till now I never understood the reason of the policy and prudence of the Spaniards in suffering the Inquisition among them. And certainly it never will be well with us till something like the Spanish Inquisition be in England." The fact is, they were never without something like it during the whole progress of theReformation, as their own histories, creeds, and confessions conclusively show.

The same histories, creeds, and confessions, with the impartial records of other writers, make it also most pointedly manifest that there is no essential difference between the spirit and conduct of the Protestant Reformers and those infernal and beastly cruelties practiced in the darkest ages of popery, and that they, as well as their Catholic ancestors, gloried in nothing greater than in building up their Zion with blood.

The persecutions in America differed only in degree, "as a

small stream differeth from a large stream," not in kind or spirit. In Massachusetts a law was passed enacting that for affirming that men are saved by works and not by faith, for opposing infant baptism, for leaving the Church when infants were about to be baptized, the offender should suffer banishment: and that whoever denied the infallibility of the Bible should, for the first offense, "be openly and severely whipped by the executioner," and for the second "might be put to death" (Ancient Laws and Charters of Mass. Bay; pub. in Boston by order Gen. Court, 1814).

The Puritan laws of New England against "a cursed sect of hereticks lately risen up in the world, which are commonly called Quakers," provided as punishment for a Quaker, on first conviction, twenty stripes; second, loss of an ear if a man, and if a woman, to be severely whipped; and the third, whether man or woman, to have the tongue bored through with a red-hot iron. If Quakers returned to the colony after banishment, they were to suffer death (date 1656–7).

On the records of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies are laws punishing with death any child above sixteen years old that should curse or smite its parents. A boy denounced to the magistrate as stubborn or rebellious, or a girl who struck her mother, was to be hanged (Laws cited, pp. 59, 60, date, 1646).

These Puritans fled from England to escape religious persecution, and to exercise the sacred right of religious freedom. How deep down in their hearts was implanted the spirit of liberty is shown by their subsequent acts. The "Blue Laws" of Connecticut are almost Draconian in their severity, and would disgrace the statute books of a Nero, or a Constantine. Quakers were fined, imprisoned or banished, scourged, burnt with hot irons, their ears cut off, or hanged, and their goods confiscated, at the caprice of a petty priest or hireling governor. Under Governor Endicot and priests Norton, Wilson, and others, these poor persecuted sectaries were driven from town to town, even into the wild forest among the wilder Indians, in the most cruel and inhuman manner. Let Sewel

tell the story of a few of their wrongs: These detestable scenes of more than savage barbarity began in the month called July, 1656. Mary Fisher and Ann Austin having arrived in the road before Boston, the deputy governor, Bellingham, had them brought on shore, and committed to prison, as Quakers. They were stripped naked under pretense of knowing whether they were witches, "and in this search," says Sewel, "they were so barbarously misused that modesty forbids to mention it." After about five weeks' imprisonment they were sent back to Old England, their beds and Bibles being taken by the jailer for his fees. Scarcely a month after, eight other persecuted Quakers came: they were locked up in the same manner as the former: and after about eleven weeks' stay were sent back. John Endicot bade them "take heed that ye break not our ecclesiastical laws, for then ye are sure to stretch by the halter." Then a law was made to prohibit all masters of ships from bringing any Quakers into that jurisdiction. Nicholas Upsal, a member of the Church, and a man of unblamable character, for speaking against such proceedings, was fined twenty-three pounds, and also imprisoned for not going to church; next they banished him from their jurisdiction; and though an aged and weakly man, he was forced to depart in the winter. Nicholas afterwards met with an Indian prince, who, having understood how he had been used, offered to make him a warm house; and further said, "What a God have the English, who deal so with one another about their God!"

The following year (1657) Anne Burden and Mary Dyer were imprisoned at Boston: and Mary Clark, for warning these persecutors to desist from their iniquity, was unmercifully rewarded with twenty stripes of a three-corded whip on her naked back, and detained in prison about three months in the winter season. The cords of these whips were commonly as thick as a man's little finger, each cord having knots at the end. Christopher Holder and John Copeland were whipped at Boston the same year, each thirty stripes with a knotted whip of three cords, the hangman measuring

his ground and fetching the strokes with all the force he could, "which so cruelly cut their flesh that a woman standing by fell down for dead." Then they were locked up in prison and kept three days without food, or so much as a drink of water, and detained in prison nine weeks in the cold winter season, without fire, bed, or straw. Lawrence and Cassandra Southick, and their son, Josiah, being carried to Boston, were all of them, notwithstanding the old age of the two, sent to the house of correction, and whipped with cords as those before, in the coldest season of the year, and had property taken from them "to the value of four pounds ten shillings," for not going to church.

In the year 1658 a law was made which, besides imposing heavy penalties and imprisonments, extended to working in the house of correction, severe whipping, cutting off ears, and boring through their tongues with a red-hot iron, whether male or female, and other inhuman barbarities. The same year William Brend and William Leddra came to Newbury; thence they were taken to Boston, to the house of correction, to work there: but they, being unwilling to submit, were kept five days without any food, and then beaten twenty strokes with a three-corded whip. Next they were put into irons, neck and heels so close together that there was no more room left between than for the lock that fastened them, and kept in that situation sixteen hours, and then brought to the mill to work; but Brend, refusing, was beaten by the inhuman jailer with a pitched rope till his flesh was bruised into a jelly, his body turned cold, and for some time he had neither seeing, feeling, nor hearing. The high priest, John Norton, was heard to say, "William Brend endeavored to beat our gospel ordinances black and blue; if then he be beaten black and blue it is but just upon him; and I will appear in the behalf of him that did so." In the same year John Copeland, Christopher Holder, and John Rous were taken up, and, in a private manner, "had their right ears cut off by authority."

As if these inhuman barbarities were not sufficient, John

Norton and other priests petitioned for a law to banish the Quakers on pain of death. The petition was granted October 20, 1658, by the court of Boston. A short extract of the law is as follows: "Whereas, there is a pernicious sect (commonly called Quakers), who do take upon them to change and alter the received laudable customs of our nation, and also to destroy the order of the churches, by denying all established forms of worship. For prevention thereof, this court doth order and enact that every person or persons, being convicted to be of the sect of the Quakers, shall be sentenced to be banished upon pain of death."

Daniel and Provided Southick, son and daughter to Lawrence and Cassandra, not frequenting the assemblies of these persecuting Puritans, were fined ten pounds, though it was well known they had no estate, their parents having been reduced to poverty by their rapacious persecutors. To get this money the general court at Boston issued an order, by which the treasurers of the several counties were empowered to sell the bodies of said persons to any of the English nation at Virginia or Barbadoes, to pay their fines. William Maston, at Hampton, was fined ten pounds for two books found in his house, five pounds for not frequenting their church, and three pounds besides as due to the priest; for which fine he had taken from him property worth more than twenty pounds. Not long after, over a thousand pounds were taken from some, only because they had separated themselves from the persecuting church. Thomas Prince, governor of Plymouth, was heard to say, "that in his conscience the Quakers were such a people as deserved to be destroyed, they, their wives and children, their houses and lands, without pity or mercy." Humphrey Norton, at New Haven, for being a Quaker, was severely whipped, and burnt in the hand with the letter H to signify heretic. The sentence of death was executed upon William Robinson and Marmaduke Stephenson, upon the twenty-seventh of October, 1659. As they approached the gallows, the priest (Wilson) tauntingly said to Robinson, "Shall such Jacks as you

come in before authority with their hats on?" To which Robinson replied, "Mind you, mind you, it is for the not putting off the hat we are put to death!" The persons who were hanged were barbarously used, even their shirts were ripped off with a knife, and their naked bodies cast into a hole that was dug, without any covering. And Priest Wilson also made a ballad on them. On the thirty-first of March, 1660, Mary Dyer was sentenced to death by Endicot, and the next day executed. William Leddra returned to Boston, was cast into an open prison, and locked in chains day and night, in a very cold winter, and was sentenced to death and executed on the fourteenth of January, 1661. Many, both men and women, were stripped naked from the waist upward, tied to a cart-tail, and scourged in the most brutal and barbarous manner, while the priests, who were the principal instigators to such more than savage meanness, were pleased in nothing better than in the exercise of such Christian and diabolical cruelties. Peter Pearson and Judith Brown, being stripped to the waist, were fastened to a cart-tail and whipped through the town of Boston. Joseph Southick also was stripped and led through the streets of Boston at the cart-tail and vehemently scourged by the hangman. The same day he was whipped at Roxbury, and the next morning at Dedham. The whip used for these executions was not of whip-cord, but of dried guts, and each string had three knots at the end. At Dover, Anne Coleman, Mary Tomkins, and Alice Ambrose were sentenced to be fastened to the cart-tail and whipped on their naked backs through eleven towns, a distance of nearly eighty miles. Then, on a very cold day, the deputy, Walden, at Dover, caused these women to be stripped naked, from the middle upward, and tied to a cart, and then whipped them, while the priest looked on and laughed at it. Two of their friends testified against Walden's cruelty, for which they were put in the stocks. The women were carried to Hampton, and there whipped; from thence to Salsbury, and again whipped. William Barefoot at length obtained the warrant

from the constable for their release, the priest, however, vainly protesting. Not long after, these women returned to Dover, and were again seized, while in meeting, and barbarously dragged about at the instigation of Hate-evil Nutwell, a ruling elder. The barbarity of their persecutors on this occasion exceeded all description. Being seized in meeting, while on their knees in prayer, they were dragged by their arms nearly a mile through a deep snow, across fields and over stumps, by which they were much bruised. The next day they were barbarously dragged down a steep hill to the water side and threatened with drowning, and one of them was actually plunged into the water, when a sudden shower obliged the Christians to retreat. At length, after much abuse, these victims of orthodox barbarity were turned out of doors at midnight; and, with their clothes wet and frozen, were obliged to suffer the inclemency of a severe winter's night. Afterwards, Anne Coleman and four of her friends were whipped through Salem, Boston, and Dedham by order of Hawthorne, the magistrate. Anne Coleman was a little weakly woman, and, while she was fastened to the cart at Dedham, the executioner, encouraged by Priest Bellingham, struck her so savagely that, with the knot of the whip, he split the nipple of her breast, which so tortured her that it almost took away her life.

These are a few instances, narrated in the briefest and driest manner, of the savage cruelty practiced by those who pretended that they had left England to enable them to exercise liberty of conscience. By their character one would think that they "left their country for their country's good." instead of for their own. Such was Protestantism in all its purity of Puritanism! Such were the fiends which the Christian religgion made of men!

To give a clear idea of the toleration shown by our intensely moral and saintly Puritan ancestors, some extracts are taken from the Connecticut code of 1650, from the civil compact entered into and adopted, in 1638–9, by the strictly Protestant towns of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield in Con-

necticut; and also from what have been known for over two centuries as the Blue Laws of Connecticut. The original orthography is followed:

PROFANE SWEARING.

It is ordered, and by this Courte decreed, That if any person within this jurissdiction shall sweare rashly and vainely, either by the holy name of God, or any other oath, and shall sinfully and wickedly curse any, hee shall forfeitt to the common treasure, for every such severe offence, ten shillings: And it shall bee in the power of any magistrate, by warrant to the constable, to call such persons before him, and uppon just proofe to pass a sentence, and levye the said penalty, according to the usual order of justice; and if such persons bee not able, or shall utterly refuse to pay the aforesaid fyne, hee shall bee committed to the stocks, there to continue, not exceeding three hours, and not less than one houre.

TRESSPASSES.

It is ordered by this Courte and authority thereof, That if any horse or other beast, trespass in corne, or other inclosure, being fenced in such sorte as secures against cowes, oxen, small calves, and such like orderly cattle, the party or parties tresspassed, shall procure two able men of good reporte and creditt, to view and adjudge the harmes, which the owner of the beast shall satisfie (when knowne) uppon reasonable demaund, whether the beast were impounded or not: but if the owner bee known and neare residing, as in the same towne, or the like, notice shall bee left at the usuall place of his aboade, of the trespass, before an estimation bee made thereof, to the end hee, or any others appointed by him, may bee present when the judgement is made: the like notice allso, shall bee left for him, of the dammage charged uppon him, that if hee approve not thereof, hee may repaire to the select townsmen, or some of them, who shall, in such case, nominate and appoint two able and indifferent men, to review and adjudge the said harmes, which being forthwith dis-

charged, together with the charge of the notice, former and latter view, and determination of dammages, the first judgement to bee void, or else to stand in lawe.

LYINGE.

Whereas truth in words, as well as in actions, is required of all men, especially, of christians, who are the professed servants of the Lord of truth: and whereas all lying is contrary to truth, and some sortes of lyes are not only sinfull as all lyes are, but allso, pernicious to the publique weal and injurious to perticular persons:

It is therefore ordered by this courte, and authority thereof, That every person of the age of discretion, which is accounted fourteene yeares, who shall wittingly and willingly, make or publish any lye, which may be pernicious to the publique weal, or tending to the dammage or injury of any perticular person, to deceive and abuse the people with false news or reportes, and the same duly prooved in any courte, or before any one magistrate, who hath hereby power graunted, to heare and determine all offences against this lawe, such persons shall be fyned for the first offence, ten shillings, or if the party be unable to pay the same, then to bee sett in the stocks so long as the said courte or magistrate shall appointe, in some open place, not exceeding three houres; for the second offence in that kinde, whereof any shall be legally convicted, the summe of twenty shillings, or be whipped uppon the naked body, not exceeding twenty stripes, and for the third offence that way, forty shillings, or if the party bee unable to pay, then to bee whipped with more stripes, not exceeding thirtye; and if yett, any shall offend in like kinde, and bee legally convicted thereof, such person, male or female, shall bee fyned ten shillings at a time, more then formerly, or if the party so offending, bee unable to pay, then to be whipped with five or six stripes more than formerly, not exceeding forty at any time: And for all such as being under age of discretion, that shall offend in lyinge contrary to this order, theire parents or masters shall give them due correction, and

that in the presence of some officer, if any magistrate shall so appointe; provided allso, that no person shall bee barred of his just action of slander, or otherwise, by any proceeding uppon this order.

IDLENES.

It is ordered by this courte and authority thereof, That no person, howseholder, or other, shall spend his time idely or unprofitably, under paine of such punnishment, as the courte shall thinke meete to inflict, and for this end, it is ordered, that the constable of every place, shall use speciall care and dilligence, to take knowledge of offenders in this kinde; especially, of common coasters, unproffitable fowlers, and tobacko takers, and present the same unto any magistrate, who shall have power to heare and determine the case, or transsfer it to the next courte.

FFORGERIE.

It is ordered by this Courte, and authority thereof, That if any person shall forge any debt, or conveyance, testament, bond, bill, release, acquittance, letter of attorneye, or any writing to prevent equity and justice, he shall stand in the pillorye three severall lecture dayes, and render double dammages to the partye wronged; and allso, bee disabled to give any evidence or verdict to any Courte or magistrate.

MINISTERS MEINTENANCE.

Whereas the most considerable persons in the land came into these partes of America, that they might enjoye Christe, in his ordinances, without disturbance; and whereas, amongst many other pretious meanes, the ordinances have beene, and are dispensed amongst us, with much purity and power, they tooke it into their serious consideration, that a due meintenance according to God, might bee provided and settled, both for the present and future, for the incouragement of the ministers worke therein: and doe order, that those who are taught in the word, in the several plantations, bee called

together, that every man voluntarily sett downe what hee is willing to allow to that end and use; and if any man refuse to pay a meete proportion, that then hee bee rated by authority, in some just and equall way; and if after this, any man withhold or delay due payment, the civil power to be exercised as in other just debts.

CHILDREN.

Fforassmuch as the good education of children is of singular behoofe and benefit to any commonwealth; and whereas many parents and masters are too indulgent and negligent of theire duty in that kinde:

It is therefore ordered by this courte, and authority thereof, That the selectmen of every towne in the severall precincts and quarters where they dwell, shall have a vigilent eye over theire brethren and neighbours, to see, first, that none of them shall suffer so much barbarisme in any of theire familyes, as not to indeavor to teach by themselves or others, theire children and apprentices, so much learning, as may inable them perfectly to read the English tongue, and knowledge of the capitall lawes, uppon penalty of twenty shillings for each neglect therein: allso, that all masters of familyes, doe, once a week, at least, catechise theire children and servants, in the grounds and principles of religion, and if any bee unable to doe so much, that then, at the least, they procure such children or apprentices to learne some shorte orthodox catechisme, without booke that they may bee able to answer to the questions that shall bee propounded to them out of such catechismes by theire parents or masters, or any of the selectmen, where they shall call them to a tryall of what they have learned in this kinde; and further, that all parents and masters doe breed and bring up theire children and apprentices in some honest lawfull calling, labour or imployment, either in husbandry or some other trade proffitable for themselves and the commonwealth, if they will not nor cannott traine them up in learning, to fitt them for higher imploy-

ments; and if any of the selectmen, after admonition by them given to such masters of familyes, shall finde them still negligent of theire duty, in the perticulars afore-mentioned, whereby children and servants become rude, stubborne, and unruly, the said selectmen, with the helpe of two magistrates, shall take such children or apprentices from them, and place them with some masters for years, boyes till they come to twenty-one, and girls eighteene years of age compleat, which will more strictly look unto and force them to submitt unto government, according to the rules of this order, if by faire meanes and former instructions they will not bee drawn unto it.

TOBACKO.

fforasmuch as it is observed, that many abuses are crept in, and comitted, by frequent taking of tobacko.

It is ordered by the authority of this Courte, That no person under the age of twenty-one years, nor any other, that hath not already accustomed himselfe to the use thereof, shall take any tobacko, until hee hath brought a certificate under the hands of some who are approved for knowledge and skill in phisick, that it is usefull for him, and allso, that hee hath received a lycense from the courte, for the same.—And for the regulating of those, who either by theire former taking it, have, to theire owne apprehensions, made it necessary to them, or uppon due advice, are pursuaded to the use thereof.

It is ordered, That no man within this colonye, after the publication hereof, shall take any tobacko, publiquely, in the streett, highwayes, or any barne yardes, or uppon training dayes, in any open places, under the penalty of six-pence for each offence against this order, in any the perticulars thereof, to bee paid without gainesaying, upon conviction, by the testimony of one witness, that is without just exception, before any one magistrate. And the constables in the severall townes, are required to make presentment to each particular courte, of such as they doe understand, and can evict to bee transgressors of this order.

The following are some of the Capital Laws of our excessively liberal ancestors. The Bible has been the foundation for nearly all the crimes committed by Christians, but it remained for the Puritans of New England to place that inspired work upon the statute books of a State, the government of which was ostensibly founded upon the love of liberty. They are transferred from the Bible almost word for word, and the spirit is followed with fearful exactness. If our forefathers executed them as literally as they copied them, evil-doers might well have trembled:

CAPITALL LAWES.

1. If any man after legall conviction, shall have or worship any other God but the Lord God, hee shall bee put to death. Deut. 13. 6—17. 2.—Exodus 22. 20.

2. If any man or woman bee a Witch, that is, hath or consulteth with a familliar spirritt, they shall bee put to death. Exodus 22. 18.—Levit. 20. 27.—Deut. 18. 10, 11.

3. If any person shall blaspheme the name of God the ffather, Sonne or holy Ghost, with direct, express, presumptuous or highhanded blasphemy, or shall curse in the like manner, hee shall bee put to death. Lev. 24. 15, 16.

4. If any person shall committ any willfull murther, which is manslaughter committed uppon malice, hatred or cruelty, not in a man's necessary and just defence, nor by mere casuality against his will, hee shall be put to death. Exo. 21. 12, 13, 14.—Numb. 35. 30, 31.

5. If any person shall slay another through guile, either by poisonings or other such Devilish practice, hee shall bee put to death. Exo. 21. 14.

6. If any man or woman shall lye with any beast or bruite creature, by carnall copulation, they shall surely bee put to death, and the beast shall be slaine and buried. Levit. 20. 15, 16.

7. If any man lyeth with mankind as hee lyeth with woman, both of them have committed abomination, they both shall surely be put to death.—Levit. 20. 13.

8. If any person committeth adultery with a married or espoused wife, the Adulterer and the Adulteress shall surely bee put to death. Levit. 20. 10, and 18. 20.—Deut. 22. 23, 24.

9. If any man shall forcibly, and without consent, Ravish any maide, or woman that is lawfully married or contracted, hee shall bee put to death.—Deut. 22. 25.

10. If any man stealeth a man or mankinde, hee shall bee put to death.—Exodus 21. 16.

11. If any man rise up by false wittness, wittingly and of purpose to take away any man's life, hee shall bee put to death.—Deut. 19. 16. 18. 19.

12. If any man shall conspire or attempt any invasion, insurrection or rebellion against the Commonwealth, hee shall bee put to death.

13. If any Childe or Children above sixteene years old and of suffitient understanding, shall Curse or smite their naturall father or mother, hee or they shall bee put to death; unless it can bee sufficiently testified that the parents have beene very unchristianly negligent in the education of such children, or so provoke them by extreme and cruell correction that they have beene forced thereunto to preserve themselves from death, maiming.—Exo. 21. 17.—Levit. 20.—Ex. 21. 15.

14. If any man have a stubborne and rebellious sonne of sufficient yeares and understanding, viz., Sixteene yeares of age, which will not obey the voice of his father or the voice of his mother, and that when they have chastened him will not hearken unto them; then may his ffather and mother, being his naturall parents, lay hold on him and bring him to the Magistrates assembled in Courte, and testifie unto them, that theire sonne is stubborne and rebellious and will not obey theire voice and Chastisement, but lives in sundry notorious Crimes, such a sonne shall bee put to death. Dut. 21. 20, 21.

The following are a few of the famous "Blue Laws" of Connecticut. They are from the Rev. Samuel Peters' book,

"General History of Connecticut," and are extracted from a summary of that gentleman's work:

Conspiracy against this Dominion shall be punished with death.

Whoever says there is a power and jurisdiction above and over this Dominion, shall suffer death and loss of property.

Whoever attempts to change or overturn this Dominion shall suffer death.

The judges shall determine controversies without a jury.

No one shall be a freeman, or give a vote, unless he be converted, and a member in full communion of one of the Churches allowed in this dominion.

No man shall hold any office, who is not sound in the faith, and faithful to this Dominion; and whoever gives a vote to such a person, shall pay a fine of £1: for a second offense he shall be disfranchised.

Each freeman shall swear by the blessed God to bear true allegiance to this Dominion, and that Jesus is the only King.

No Quaker or Dissenter from the established worship of this Dominion shall be allowed to give a vote for the election of Magistrates, or any officer.

No food or lodging shall be afforded to a Quaker, Adamite, or other Heretic.

If any person turns Quaker, he shall be banished, and not suffered to return but upon pain of death.

No Priest shall abide in the Dominion: he shall be banished, and suffer death on his return. Priests may be seized by any one without a warrant.

No one to cross a river, but with an authorized ferryman.

No one shall run on the Sabbath-day, or walk in the garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting.

No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave, on the Sabbath-day.

No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or fasting-day.

The Sabbath shall begin at sunset on Saturday.

A person accused of trespass in the night shall be judged guilty, unless he clear himself by his oath.

When it appears that an accused has confederates, and he refuses to discover them, he may be racked.

No one shall buy or sell lands without permission of the selectmen.

A drunkard shall have a master appointed by the selectmen, who are to debar him from the liberty of buying and selling.

Whoever publishes a lye to the prejudice of his neighbor, shall sit in the stocks, or be whipped fifteen stripes.

No Minister shall keep a school.

Every rateable person who refuses to pay his proportion to the support of the minister of the town or parish, shall be fined by the Court £2, and £4 every quarter, until he or she pay the rate to the Minister.

No one shall read Common-Prayer, keep Christmas or Saints'-days, make minced pies, dance, play cards, or play on any instrument of music, except the drum, trumphet, and jews'-harp.

Fornication shall be punished by compelling marriage, or as the court may think proper.

Adultery shall be punished with death.

A man that strikes his wife shall pay a fine of £10; a woman that strikes her husband shall be punished as the Court directs.

No man shall court a maid in person, or by letter, without first obtaining consent of her parents: £5 penalty for the first offense, £10 for the second; and for the third imprisonment during the pleasure of the Court.

Married persons must live together, or be imprisoned.

Every male shall have his hair cut round, according to a cap.

Thomas Dick, LL.D., in his "Philosophy of Religion" says: "Notwithstanding the unjust and cruel sufferings which English Protestants endured from popish priests and rulers, a

short period only elapsed, after they had risen to power, before they began, in their turn, to harass their dissenting brethren, with vexations and cruel prosecutions, and fines and imprisonments, till they were forced to seek for shelter in a distant land."

"But we need not go back even to the distance of half a century in order to find instances of religious intolerance among Protestant communities and churches; our own times unhappily furnish too many examples of a bigoted, intolerant, and persecuting spirit. Little more than two years have elapsed since the Methodist chapel in Barbadoes was thrown down and demolished by the *mob-gentry*, and with the connivance of the public authorities of that slave trafficking island, and Mr. Shrewsbury, a worthy and respected pastor and missionary, obliged to flee for his life. Previous to this outrage, he suffered every species of insult, contumely, and reproach. He was abused as a villain, and hissed at in the streets, not by mere rabble, but by the *great vulgar;* by merchants from their stores, and individuals in the garb of gentlemen. By such characters his chapel was surrounded, and partly filled, on Sunday the fifth of October, 1823. Thin glass bottles had been previously prepared and filled with a mixture of oil and assafœtida; and all of a sudden, they were thrown with great violence in the midst of the people, and one was aimed at the head of the preacher; and during the whole service, stones were rattling against the chapel from every quarter. On the next Sabbath an immense concourse of people assembled, 'breathing out threatenings and slaughter;' and from twenty to thirty of the *gentlemen-mob* planted themselves around the pulpit apparently ready for any mischief. Men wearing masks, and having swords and pistols, came galloping down the street and presenting their pistols, fired them at the door; and it was originally designed to have fire crackers among the females, to set their clothes on fire. At length, on Sabbath the nineteenth, this execrable mob, consisting of nearly two hundred *gentlemen*, and others, again assembled, with hammers, saws, hatchets, crows, and every other neces-

sary implement; and in the course of a few hours, the lamps, benches, pews, pulpit, and even the walls, were completely demolished. They entered the dwelling-house, broke the windows and doors, threw out the crockery ware, chopped up tables, chairs and every article of furniture: tore the manuscripts of the preacher, and destroyed a library of more than three hundred volumes. All this was done under the light of the full moon, in the presence of an immense crowd of spectators, without the least attempt being made to check them either by the civil or military authorities, while the unfortunate preacher, with his wife in an advanced state of pregnancy, had to flee to a neighboring island to save his life! Such is the tolerant and humane conduct of *gentlemen* Protestants of the nineteenth century! gentlemen who would, no doubt, consider it very unhandsome were they to be compared to Goths and Vandals, or to the rude and barbarous savages of Papua or New Holland.

"About the same period, the authorities of Demerara set on foot a persecution against Mr. Smith, missionary from the London Society, under various pretexts: but his real crime in the eyes of his persecuters, was, his unwearied zeal in instructing the negroes in the knowledge of religion. He was condemned to death by a court martial, in the face of every principle of justice; he died in prison, was refused the privilege of a Christian burial, and his friends were prohibited from erecting a stone to mark the spot where his body was laid. The whole details of this transaction present a scene of savage barbarity, created by the lust of gain, scarcely to be paralleled in the history of Europe.

"In Switzerland, which was formerly the headquarters of Protestantism, the demon of religious persecution has again reared its head. The council of state of the Pays de Vaud, at the instigation of the clergy, on January 15, 1825, published a decree, 'prohibiting, under the penalty of severe fines and imprisonments, all meetings for religious worship or instruction, other than those of the established Church;' and in the following May, another decree was issued. which

denounces 'fines, imprisonment, or banishment, upon the most private kind of religious assembly, or even the admission of a single visitor to family worship.' In pursuance of these disgraceful laws, several ministers and private Christians of high character for piety and acquirements, have been banished from the Canton, some for one and some for two years, cut off from all means of subsistence, unless possessed of independent fortunes, and left perhaps to starve and perish in foreign lands. If they returned before the expiration of their sentence, it is said that death is the punishment to be inflicted. One poor man, a schoolmaster in the principality of Neufchatel, has been condemned to *ten* years' banishment. He was brought out from prison, tied with cords, and compelled to kneel in the snow in the public square to hear his sentence read. His crime was, gathering together a few fellow-Christians in his own house, and there having the Lord's supper administered by a regularly ordained minister.

"And is England pure from the spirit of persecution and intolerance? Let us see. At Keneridge in Dorsetshire a worthy and excellent individual, belonging to the Wesleyan denomination, had attended on a green, where twenty or thirty persons usually congregated, on a Sunday afternoon to listen to the truths he thought it important to declare. The clergyman of the parish approached with a retinue of servants and *commanded* him to desist. The preacher took no notice of the command and proceeded to read his text. The clergyman then commanded the tithing-man to seize him. He was directed to be conveyed to Wareham jail; and to every question the preacher put, as to the ground of his being seized upon, the *reverend* and *worthy* clergyman only replied by the brandishing of his stick. Instances have occurred in which clergymen of the establishment have refused to *bury the dead.* At Chidds Ercal, in Shropshire, the child of a poor man was refused interment, and the father was obliged to carry it six miles, before it could be laid at rest in its mother earth. At Catsfield, in Sussex, a similar act of infamy was committed. At the moment when the bell had tolled, when the earth was

to fall heavily upon the coffin, containing the only remains of the being that affection had endeared, and when those who stood by needed all the consolations that religion can supply, at this moment the clergyman appeared, but advanced only to give pain to the mourners, and to agonize the parent's heart, by saying, 'Now that you have waited an hour till it suited me to come, I will not inter your child! I did not know that you were Dissenters. Take your child somewhere else, take it where you please, but here it shall not lie in consecrated ground.' And, in fact, they were compelled to carry the child away eleven miles, from the abode of its parents, and from the place that gave it birth, before it could find repose in its kindred dust. At Mevagissey, in the county of Cornwall, the vicar refused to allow the corpse of a Dissenter to be brought within the church, and, therefore, read the burial service in the open air; but, in consequence of which he read only a part of that service, and omitted the most beautiful portion. Such a power appears to be conceded to the clergy by the laws of the church; but the spirit which gave it existence is deeply to be deplored, as the spirit of bigotry and intolerance. At Wellingborough, a clergyman, in opposition to a custom which had been established for sixty years, issued orders that no bell should toll when a Dissenter expired. He boldly avowed, 'that he never would permit the passing bell to be rung for a Dissenter, even in the event of an interment in the churchyard; that while he held the curacy, no bell of his church should ever toll for a Dissenter; and that he would not even permit the bells to ring for a marriage where the parties were Dissenters.' In reference to this case, an appeal was made to the bishop of Peterborough, who wrote a long letter on the subject, and defended the conduct of this Wellingborough curate. At Newport Pagnel, two persons of decent appearance, teachers of Baptist societies, were collecting subscriptions for the erection of a new place of worship. After arriving at the residence of the parish clergyman, they were taken before a clerical magistrate, who, upon the oath of the other clergyman, that they were

rogues and vagrants, committed them to Aylesbury jail: where they were confined for three weeks in common with the basest felons; among convicted thieves of the most abandoned character: nay, more, they were sentenced to the treadmill, and kept at hard labor there, though, during the whole time, one of them was afflicted with spitting of blood. Their papers were seized upon: their money was taken from them; and by means of it the expense of sending them to prison was defrayed.

"All the above-stated instances, and many others of a similar description, occurred within the limits of the year 1824; and every year since the 'Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty' was formed, similar instances, some of them of a more barbarous nature, have been brought forth to public view."

After such an exhibition of Protestant intolerance we are prepared for almost anything. It would seem that religion of all kinds has only resulted in debasing man, rendering him more savage than the beasts of prey. He certainly has shown more ingenuity in inflicting torture upon his fellow-man than the cruelest tiger that roams the jungle. As our religious beliefs fade away, however, we become civilized, and should Christianity recede as fast in the coming twenty-five years as it has in the quarter century just past, the earth will stand a fair chance of becoming a habitable place.

Protestantism is not a religion of progress, except so far as it is compelled to be by the advancement of science. Its warfare upon science has held the same ratio to that of the Catholics as have its persecutions. Coming later by centuries into the world, it has not had the same opportunity, but the chances it has had it has not been slow to seize. The same dependence upon the Holy Scriptures for the sum of man's knowledge has characterized Protestants as peculiarly as Catholics. From the dogmatic reformer of Germany to our own day, religion, Protestant as well as Catholic, has been inimical to science. It has been shown in the various ways peculiar to believers in revelation, from burning men at the

stake to excluding scientists from professorships in colleges. The spirit is still rampant, and Protestants possess as fair a share of it as their Catholic brethren. Darwin has suffered denunciation no less than Copernicus, and if he has not been subjected to the same religious treatment as was the ancient astronomer, it is because of the lapse of time and the widespread diffusion of Liberalism, and not because Christianity has changed. The epithets of Infidel and Atheist are hurled at him and his fellow-scientists, Huxley, Haeckel, and Tyndall, with the same vehemence on the part of Protestant ministers as was used to denounce Copernicus, Kepler, and Newton by the religious powers of Europe. It is not by any means a pleasant fact to find that Protestant Christianity is no better than its scarlet mother—that the reformers are not reformed, and that they have only changed a Catholic for a Protestant pope. Truth needs no tortures to sustain it, and if the persecutions of the professors of a faith prove anything, it is that the religion is false and founded upon the shifting sands of delusion rather than upon the eternal principles of right and wrong. The persecutor feels that his religion will not bear the keen scrutiny of criticism, and the most natural resort is to silence the critic. His arguments are useless, but his sword stills if it does not convert his opponent.

Prof. White, President of Cornell University—an institution which has felt the blighting effects of revealed religion—in his little work, "The Warfare of Science," has given some of the actions of Protestants against science. It is on his authority, corroborated by a host of reliable historians, that the few following facts are given. Volumes might be adduced, but the lack of space forbids.

The sturdy renegade of Germany was the first Protestant, and therefore Protestant persecution began with him. Says this monk: "People gave ear to an upstart astrologer, who strove to show that the earth revolves, not the heavens or the firmament, the sun and the moon. Whoever wishes to appear clever must devise some new system, which of all systems is, of course, the very best. The fool wishes to reverse

the entire science of astronomy. But sacred Scripture tells us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth."

Luther forgets that his own is a new system and he but an "upstart" theologian. But "orthodoxy is my doxy and heredoxy your doxy." His system, "which, of all systems is, of course, the very best," was at least as heretical as the doctrine of Copernicus, but then, "this fool" wished "to reverse the entire science of" theology, and that made the difference in the prefix to the doxy.

Melancthon, meek as he was, endeavored to keep pace with Luther in his denunciation of Copernicus. In his treatise, *Initia Doctrinae Physicae*, he says: "The eyes are witnesses that the heavens revolve in the space of twenty-four hours. But certain men, either from the love of novelty, or to make a display of ingenuity, have concluded that the earth moves; and they maintain that neither the eighth sphere nor the sun revolves. . . . Now, it is a want of honesty and decency to assert such doctrines publicly, and the example is pernicious. It is a part of a good mind to accept the truth as revealed by God, and to acquiesce in it." Melancthon then proves to his own satisfaction, and to that of all Christians, from Psalms and from Ecclesiastes that "the earth can be nowhere if not in the centre of the universe." "And Protestant people," adds Prof. White, "were not a whit behind Catholics in following out these teachings. The people of Elbing made themselves merry over a farce in which Copernicus was the main object of ridicule. The people of Nuremberg, a great Protestant centre, caused a medal to be struck with inscriptions ridiculing the philosopher and his theory."

Descartes was hunted to death by Protestant theologians of Holland who sought to bring him to torture on the charge of Atheism, and their zeal was emulated by the Catholics of France who prevented the rendering of any due honor to him at his burial. A hundred and fifty years after Galileo's condemnation, a Protestant priest, Mallet du Parr, endeavored to palliate the sentence, arguing that he was condemned, not

because he affirmed the motion of the earth, but because he supported it from Scripture. Kepler, too, did not escape with only Catholic persecution. The Protestants in Styria and Tübingen were not less zealous in suppressing him and setting aside his three famous laws than the Catholics at Rome.

The Protestantism of England was as fully imbued with the spirit of religious bigotry as the older Church. In 1772 sailed the famous scientific expedition under Cook. The greatest of all the scientists chosen to accompany it was Dr. Priestley. But he was considered unsound on the wonderful doctrine of the trinity—it was suspected that his heresy would vitiate his astronomical observations—and he was rejected by the creed-bound clergy of Oxford and Cambridge. So late as 1868 there was a Lutheran assemblage at Berlin, to protest against "science falsely so called," in the midst of which stood Pastor Knak denouncing the Copernican theory, and advancing views which are certainly Scriptural, but which every schoolboy knows to be none the less ridiculous. And Prof. Stuart, in our own Andover, declared that geology was becoming dangerous; that to speak of six periods of time for the creation was flying in the face of Scripture: that Genesis expressly speaks of six days, each made up of a morning and an evening, and not six periods of time. In Scotland, in the beginning of this century, the use of fanning-mills for winnowing grain was denounced as contrary to the text, "The wind bloweth where it listeth," as leaguing with Satan, who is "prince of the powers of the air," and as sufficient cause for excommunication from the Scotch Church.

In concluding his little book—admirable as an epitome of the conflict between science and religion—Prof. White bears this strong testimony against the much-vaunted toleration of the Protestants: "Do conscientious Roman bishops in France labor to keep all scientific instruction under their own control—in their own universities and colleges; so do very many not less conscientious Protestant clergymen in our own country insist that advanced education in science and literature shall be kept under control of their own sectarian universities

and colleges, wretchedly one-sided in their development, and miserably inadequate in their equipment: did a leading Spanish university, until a recent period, exclude professors holding the Newtonian theory; so does a leading American college exclude professors holding the Darwinian theory: have Catholic colleges in Italy rejected excellent candidates for professorships on account of 'unsafe' views regarding the Immaculate Conception; so are Protestant colleges in America every day rejecting excellent candidates on account of 'unsafe' views regarding the Apostolic Succession or the Incarnation, or Baptism, or the Perseverance of the Saints."

Prof. White, in denouncing 'the insolent interference of ecclesiastics with science, gives this resounding blow to the Jewish Bible: "There has never been a scientific theory framed from the use of Scriptural texts, wholly or partially, which has been made to stand. Such attempts have only subjected their authors to derision, and Christianity to suspicion. From Cosmas finding his place in the universe in the Jewish tabernacle, to Increase Mather sending mastodons' bones to England as the remains of giants mentioned in Scripture; from Bellarmine declaring that the sun cannot be the centre of the universe because such an idea 'vitiates the whole Scriptural plan of salvation,' to a recent writer declaring that an evolution theory cannot be true because St. Paul says that 'all flesh is not the same flesh,' the result has always been the same."

An old German divine of the Reformation period gave this excellent advice to Bible scientists: "Seeking the milk of the word, do not press the teats of Holy Writ too hard," as the Sacred Cow might in such event kick the milk, milker, and milk-pail into oblivion, and they would all be eternally lost in the mire of the barnyard.

Another crime which must be laid at the door of the Protestant Church of America is the toleration for so many years of the institution of slavery. Not only did the divines of the South uphold the institution in private and in their pulpits, but the cringing clergy of the North aped their hypocrit-

ical teachings and smilingly repeated that cursed phrase, "Servants obey your masters!" Forty millions of Protestants stood by and saw three millions of human beings chained body and soul—slaves to a few churchmen. Husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, were seized by Protestants, separated by Protestants, and sold by Protestants to Protestants. Protestant masters debauched and ruined their slaves; Protestant owners hung them up by their thumbs, and Protestant overseers cut their bare backs to the bone with a cat-o'-nine-tails. Slaves ran away from Protestants, and Protestants pursued them with bloodhounds trained for this purpose by Protestants. The swamps of the Carolinas could tell stories of Protestant cruelty to Protestant slaves that would make the very trees sigh in sorrow for the brutality of Christian slave-drivers. Many a low log cabin of Virginia has witnessed scenes of horror and brutal lust as terrible to the poor victims as the rack or scaffold. The burning-iron and the scourge have not been used exclusively on the Quakers. Many a negro bears upon his body the seared scar of the branding-iron and the purple lines of the Protestant whip. And what did the thousands of Protestant ministers do? Preached, every one of them, from carefully selected Bible texts to prove that slavery was a divine institution. When the drunken Noah swore at his son, he put into the mouths of those godly men a potent argument for slavery. "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be," has been hurled at the negroes and heretical Abolitionists from nearly every Protestant pulpit, North and South When the negro, fleeing from stripes and branding-irons, came into Puritanical New England, was he fed, or housed, or clothed? Yes, by the Quakers—not by the Protestants. If a weary slave came to the house of an Episcopalian or a Presbyterian, he was handed over to the authorities, in pursuance of a law enacted by Protestants, that the United States Government should turn slave-hunter, and run with its nose to the ground like a hound at the bidding of Southern Protestants.

And what influence was it that brought freedom to the

manacled slave toiling in the swamps of Georgia or the burning sun of Louisiana? Was it the Protestant Church? Was it the Methodists, or the Presbyterians, or the Episcopalians, or the Baptists? Was it any or all of these? No. It was the hated heretics every time. It was the men who ridiculed the infallibility of the pope and laughed at the Immaculate Conception. It was the Parkers and Pillsburys, the Garrisons and Phillipses, aided by a host of Abolitionists—heretics every one. They read the first line of our grand charter of liberty, and then set free three millions of human beings. Slavery, its perpetuation and crimes, are an eternal blot upon the Christian Church of America.

When Protestants are disposed to taunt Catholics with the cruelties of the mother Church, let them turn their gaze inward, reflect, and forbear. Let them remember Koppezoon and the papists of the Netherlands; the Anabaptists hunted to death by Luther and Zwingli. Let them remember Servetus and Castalio, Huss and Jerome of Prague. Let them recollect the torture of the Dissenters of England and of the Quakers of America. Let them think of the massacres of Mornas and Montbrison, and the burning of witches. Let them call to their calloused minds the reign of Elizabeth and of James I. Let them bring to their hiding thoughts the names of Knox and Endicot, the career of Mather and Norton, the persecutions by the Gomarists, and the sufferings by the Arminians. Let them go back only a few short years to our Southern States, and there let them hark to the sounds of torture. Let them listen to the crack of the overseer's whip, the shrieks of the slave at the whipping-post, the hissing noise of the branding-iron as it burns into the shrinking flesh, the cries of women as their babes are torn from their clinging arms, or the subdued sobs of families sold apart. Let them bend their ears to the footfalls of fleeing slaves, the baying of the pursuing bloodhound, the oaths and furious threats of the drivers, and the crack of the owner's pistols. Let them remember all these and a thousand other crimes against humanity, and forever hold their peace about their Mother.

URBAN VIII.

Upon the death of Gregory XV., A. D. 1623, Maffeo Barberino was elevated to the pontificate under the title of Urban VIII. Barberino was the most detested and feared of all the cardinals, but his unscrupulous treachery gained him a majority of the votes in the sacred conclave. On the first ballot he did not receive one vote. He sent orders to his friends, who rallied in the streets of the city, reinforced by bandits and robbers, and demanded of the cardinals that Barberino he chosen pope.

Upon the refusal of the conclave to comply with their demands, Rome became the theatre of frightful atrocities. The bravos of the cardinal pillaged houses, murdered old men and children, violated women and young girls, and threatened the conclave with death unless the cardinal of their choice was chosen pope. The sacred college daily lost some of its members, either by death or sickness, and it was noticed that those who disappeared were the ones who were most violently opposed to the terrible Barberino. It became evident to all that he was ridding himself of his opposers and competitors by poison, for those who died were carried off in a few hours after being taken sick, and they exhibited all the symptoms of having been poisoned. The conclave was seized with a panic. All opposition to Barberino ceased, and he was proclaimed sovereign pontiff.

During the first month of his pontificate Urban made use of his infallible power to manufacture a few new saints, with the expectation, no doubt, of being sainted himself by his successors. Two Theatine fanatics, a Carmelite debauchee, a fiendish and pious inquisitor, a few hysterical and extatic

females, and the blessed St. Roch and his dog were all added to the already long list of Romish saints.

Following the policy of his predecessor, Gregory, Urban determined to spread religion by force and fraud, that is, by means of the Inquisition and Jesuitism. This policy involved him in trouble with Cardinal Richelieu, Minister of Louis XIII. of France; and through the intrigues of the pope and the Jesuits, France was soon involved in a civil war, which spread until all Europe was embroiled in one bloody struggle. Before this war was ended Protestantism had made great headway and the pope had lost much of his power.

Among the many crimes charged to this representative of God is the assassination of the young duke of Urbino. Urban wised to add the territory of the duke to the States of the Church, and the readiest method of accomplishing this object, and perhaps the one most suited to his vile nature, was murder, and one morning the young duke was found dead in his bed, killed by the knife of an assassin. The dutchy of Urbino and the cities of Pesaro and Sinigaglia were immediately declared dependencies of the Roman see.

It was during the reign of this pope that Galileo excited the ire of the Inquisition by his heretical assertion that the earth revolved around the sun. Urban determined to arrest this blasphemous heresy, and the Jesuits, monks, and priests declaimed fiercely against Galileo. Some maintained that his discoveries in the heavens were base fabrications prompted by the devil for the destruction of the souls of the faithful.

For a while Galileo pursued his investigations in safety, under the protection of the grand duke of Tuscany, and endeavored to calm the theological storm he had raised by publishing a treatise in which he showed by quotations from the Fathers that the texts of Scripture should not be taken literally and could be reconciled with his discoveries. In the opinion of the pope, this was adding insult to injury, and the influence of his protector failed to save Galileo longer from the wrath of the pontiff. The great astronomer was summoned to appear before an assembly of ignorant and bigoted

cardinals, bishops, and theologians, headed by the most holy poisoner Urban. This council of stupid and fanatical prelates, having no regard for the venerable student of nature, refused to listen to the reasons he offered for his theories, and pronounced a declaration of which the following is an authentic translation:

"In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we all, assembled in this place, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, enlightened by the intelligence of the holy pontiff, decide that none of the faithful has a right to believe and maintain that the sun is placed immovable in the center of the world. We decide that this theory is false and absurd in theology, as well as heretical, because it is expressly contrary to the words of Scripture, and would imply an accusation of ignorance against God, the source of all science and the revealer of the sacred books. We also prohibit it from being taught that the earth is not placed in the center of the universe, that it is not immovable, and that it has a daily movement of rotation, because this second proposition is from the same reasons false and absurd, even in philosophy, as well as erroneous as a matter of faith."

To this declaration Galileo wished to reply, and to produce arguments which the truth suggested to him, in defense of a doctrine based on irrefutable facts; but the pope imposed silence on him, and declared that by virtue of his infallibility he decided that the earth was immoveable, and that the universe was governed by the laws pointed out in Genesis; and finally, he prohibited him from professing his new theories in future.

Glad to escape from the clutches of the religious leaders with nothing more than an admonition and prohibition, Galileo returned to Florence and resumed his studies. To prevent the results of his discoveries from being lost to the world, he collected into one work all the evidence he had found of the double movement of the earth upon its own axis and around the sun, and of its relations with the other planets in the solar system. This he arranged in the form of dialogues,

and submitted to the master of the sacred palace at Rome, who approved of it—ignorant, perhaps, of the real significance of the work—and Galileo, overjoyed at the success of his plans, immediately caused it to be printed.

The work, on its appearance, excited an uproar among the theologians and Jesuits, and Pope Urban at once handed Galileo over to the tender mercies of the Inquisition. At the age of seventy years, in very poor health, and tortured with the rheumatism, this scientist was dragged from his home, in the middle of a severe winter, and brought to Rome to await the pleasure of the Inquisition. In a letter to a friend, Galileo says:

"I arrived at Rome on the sixteenth of February, 1633, and I was delivered over to the clemency of the Inquisition and the sovereign pontiff, who had no esteem for me, because I did not know how to rhyme an epigram and a small love sonnet. I was at first confined in the palace of the Trinity of the Mount. On the next day I was visited by Father Lancio, the commissary of the Holy Office, who took me with him in his carriage. During the ride he put different questions to me, and showed a great desire that I should repair the offense I had given to all Italy by maintaining the opinion of the earth's motion; and to all the mathematical proofs which I could offer him, he replied to me in these words of Scripture, 'The earth shall be immovable for eternity, because it is immovable from eternity.' Thus discoursing, we arrived at the palace of the sacred office. I appeared before a tribunal appointed not to judge me but to condemn me. I went to work, however, to give my proofs. What pains soever I took, I could not make them comprehend me. They cut short all my reasonings by bursts of zeal, and always opposed to me the passage of Scripture concerning the victory of Joshua as the victorious piece in my trial. In turn I quoted those strange words of the holy books in which it is said, 'that the heavens are solid and polished like a brazen mirror,' to prove that we should not interpret Scripture literally if we wished the people who are not

plunged in barbarous degradation to preserve some belief in the dogmas of religion. They only replied to me by reproaches."

After this mock trial, Galileo was confined in the infected dungeons of the Inquisition, where he remained for several months. When Urban supposed that suffering, bad treatment, and starvation had sufficiently weakened the moral energy of the old astronomer, he caused him to be again examined, but as he was found to be still persistent in his belief, he had him taken to the torture-chamber. Several times the unfortunate old man underwent the torture of the cord without recanting, but finally, conquered by his terrible punishment, Galileo's spirit gave way. He was then brought before the tribunal, where he was compelled to pronounce the following abjuration: "I, Galileo, in the seventieth year of my age, being on my knees before the most eminent lords, having before my eyes the holy Gospel, which I touch with my own hands, abjure, detest, and curse the error and heresy of the motion of the earth."

It is said that after having pronounced this abjuration, the old man rose, and, striking the earth with his foot, exclaimed, "And yet it turns."

The tribunal then tore up and destroyed the works of the astronomer; and they would undoubtedly have condemned him to the stake had they not thought that his recantation would have more effect upon the world than his death. They contented themselves by condemning him to prison for an indefinite period. Such was the treatment which the infallible Urban gave one of the greatest geniuses the world ever produced. With its characteristic inconsistency, the Church universally teaches those same doctrines which it condemned as heresy little more than two hundred years ago. Truly the one true Church of God is unchanging and unchangeable—in its shuffling hypocrisy and duplicity.

After a troubled reign of twenty-one years, this pious champion of the Christian faith died, cursing and blaspheming, on the twentieth of July, 1644, at the age of seventy-six.

JAMES II.

King James II. was born in London in 1633, and was the second son of Charles I. Soon after his birth he was declared duke of York. During what is known in history as the Great Rebellion, in which his father lost his head, he resided in France, where he imbibed the principles of the Roman Catholic religion. At the Restoration he returned to England, where he secretly married Anne Hyde, daughter of the earl of Clarendon, by whom he had two daughters, who afterwards became queens of England, viz., Mary and Anne. In the Dutch war he signalized himself as commander of the English fleet, and showed great skill and bravery. On the death of his first wife, he married Mary Beatrix of Modena.

He succeeded to the throne of England on the death of Charles II. in 1685. It will be remembered with what hatred the people of England had come to regard the Catholic religion. That hatred had become one of the ruling passions of the realm, and had become as strong in the ignorant and profane as in those who were Protestants from conviction. The cruelties of Mary's reign, the conspiracies against Elizabeth, and above all the Gunpowder Plot, had left in the minds of the masses a bitter feeling of aversion against the Church of Rome. During the eighteen years that had elapsed since the Restoration, the hatred of popery had increased. The lately deceased king, Charles I., had long been suspected of a leaning to the Catholic religion. James was known to be a bigoted papist, and his first wife had died a Roman Catholic. In defiance of the remonstrances of the House of Commons, he had married Mary of Modena, another Catholic. The common people had begun to apprehended a return of the times of Bloody Queen Mary.

Great acclamations were raised over the speech of the new king to the Privy Council at the commencement of his reign, in which he declared his resolution to maintain the established government, both in Church and State. He said he knew the Church of England to be eminently loyal, and that it would always be his care to support and defend it. The members of the council broke forth into clamors of delight and gratitude. The gracious promises of the new king were echoed from all the Protestant pulpits throughout the kingdom. These promises were taken down in writing, published, and approved by James. The common people still believed the word of a king inviolable, and did not suspect that James had already formed a secret council for Catholic affairs, of which a mischievous Jesuit, called Father Petre, was one of the chief members.

James commenced his administration with a large measure of public good will; but he had resolved to make the one object of his reign the reëstablishment of the Catholic religion, and this he doggedly pursued with such a stupid obstinacy as to soon bring his career to a close.

Soon after the accession of James to the throne, the marquis of Argyle and the duke of Monmouth concerted measures for a rising in England. For this purpose they had called a meeting of Scotch exiles at Rotterdam. It was agreed that Argyle should effect a landing in Scotland, and Monmouth in England. Two of Argyle's men having been taken prisoners, the treasonable plot was exposed. While Argyle was moving toward Glasgow with a small body of Highlanders, he was betrayed by some of his followers, and imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle. James ordered him to be executed within three days. He was very anxious that the legs of the prisoner should be first pounded with his old favorite instrument of torture, called the "boot," which had been introduced by him into Scotland, and kept constantly applied. By this torment the legs of victims were ground and smashed by iron wedges. However, Argyle was simply beheaded, and his head was set upon the top of Edinburgh jail.

Monmouth landed at Lyme, and set up the standard of rebellion. He raised a force of some four thousand Protestant Dissenters, mostly armed with scythes, pitchforks, and such poor weapons as they could find. These were soon dispersed, and Monmouth was found hidden in a ditch under fern and nettles, with a few peas in his pocket which he had gathered in the fields to eat. He was taken to London, and being brought bound into the presence of the king, he made a disgraceful exhibition of himself by crawling to the king on his knees. On the fifteenth of July, 1685, he was taken out to die on Tower Hill. An immense crowd was in attendance, and spectators covered the tops of all the houses. Before laying his head upon the block he felt the edge of the axe, and told the executioner that he feared it was not sharp enough, and that the axe was not heavy enough. On the executioner replying that it was of the proper kind, the duke said: "I pray you have a care, and do not use me so awkwardly as you used my Lord Russell." The executioner, made nervous by this, and trembling, struck once, and merely gashed him in the neck. Upon this, the duke of Monmouth raised his head, and looked at the man reproachfully in the face. Then he struck twice, and then thrice, and then threw down the axe, crying out in a voice of horror that he could not finish the work. The sheriffs, however, threatening him with what should be done to himself if he did not, he took it up again, and struck a fourth time and a fifth time. Then the wretched head fell off, and James, duke of Monmouth, was dead, in the thirty-sixth year of his age.

And now follows one of the blackest and most lamentable pages in English history. The poor peasants who had taken part in the rebellion had been dispersed, and their leaders executed. But James was not satisfied. Among the intolerable monsters he let loose upon them was one Col. Kirk, a bloodthirsty wretch who had served against the Moors, and whose soldiers, in consequence of bearing a lamb upon their flag as the emblem of Christianity, came to be called Kirk's Lambs. The atrocities committed by these fiends in human

shape are too horrible to be related here. They went among them ruthlessly robbing and murdering and ruining them by making them buy their pardons at the price of all they possessed. One of Kirk's favorite amusements, while at dinner, was to have batches of prisoners hanged outside for his diversion, and when their feet quivered in the convulsions of death, he used to swear that they should have music for their dancing, and would order the drums to beat and the trumpets to play.

The number of those who were thus murdered cannot now be ascertained. Nine were registered in the parish registers of Taunton; but those registers contain the names of such only as had Christian burial. Those who were hanged in chains, and those whose heads and limbs were sent to the neighboring villages, must have been numerous. A hundred captives were put to death during the week which followed the battle. Kirk loved money as well as cruelty. A safe-conduct could be bought of him for thirty or forty pounds. These safe-conducts enabled the purchaser to pass the posts of the Lambs without molestations, to reach a seaport to fly to a foreign country. A story is also told of Kirk's conquering the virtue of a beautiful woman by promising to spare the life of one to whom she was strongly attached, and that, after she had yielded, he showed her suspended on the gallows the lifeless remains of him for whose sake she had sacrificed her honor. As an acknowledgement of his valuable services, King James informed Kirk that he was "very well pleased with his proceedings."

And now James sent Jeffreys down into the western counties, where the rebellion had taken place, to try persons accused of treason. The king pleasantly called this "Jeffreys' campaign." The people down in that part of the country remember it to this day as the Bloody Assize. This Jeffreys was a red-faced, swollen, bloated, drunken, ruffianly, horrible creature, who had been made chief justice of the Court of King's Bench. He had a bullying, roaring voice, and a more savage nature perhaps than was ever lodged in

any human breast. This monster was James' especial favorite: and he testified his admiration of him by giving him a ring from his own finger, which the people used to call Judge Jeffreys' Bloodstone. The king used to employ him to go about and bully the corporations, or, as Jeffreys himself elegantly called it, "to give them a lick with the rough side of his tongue."

Early in September, Jeffreys, accompanied by four other judges, set out on that circuit of which the memory will last as long as our race and language. The officers who commanded the troops in the districts through which his course lay had orders to furnish him with whatever military aid he might require. Jeffreys began his Bloody Assize at Winchester, where a poor deaf old lady, Mrs. Alicia Lisle, the widow of one of the judges of Charles I., was charged with having given shelter in her house to two fugitives from Sedgemoor. Three times the jury refused to find her guilty, until Jeffreys bullied and frightened them into a false verdict. When he had extorted it from them, he said, "Gentlemen, if I had been one of you, and she had been my own mother, I would have found her guilty." He sentenced her to be burned alive that very afternoon. The clergy of the cathedral and some others interfered in her favor, and she was beheaded within a week.

As a high mark of his approbation, the king made Jeffreys lord chancellor; and he then went on to Dorchester, Exeter, Taunton, and Wells. It seems astonishing that this bloated, bloody beast was not struck dead on the judgment-seat by some one. It was enough for any man or woman to be accused by an enemy before Jeffreys to be found guilty of high treason. One man who pleaded not guilty, he ordered to be taken out of court upon the instant and hanged; and this so terrified the prisoners in general that they mostly plead guilty at once. He hanged eighty people at Dorchester in the course of a few days, besides whipping, imprisoning, and selling great numbers as slaves. He executed in all about three hundred. These executions took place among the

neighbors and friends of the sentenced in thirty-six towns and villages. The bodies were mangled, steeped in caldrons of boiling pitch and tar, and hung up by the roadside, in the streets, and over the very churches. The sight and smell of heads and limbs, the hissing and burning of the infernal caldrons, and the tears and terror of the people, were dreadful beyond description. One menial who was forced to steep the remains in the black pot was ever afterwards called "Tom Boilman." The hangman has ever since been called "Jack Ketch," because a man of that name performed all the hanging for Jeffreys. Much has been written about the horrors of the French Reign of Terror; but terrible as they were, it is doubtful whether the maddened people of France ever did anything worse than was done by this lord chancellor of England, with the approval of King James, in the Bloody Assize.

While Jeffreys was at the height of his dreadful work, the king was diverting himself with horse races in the very place where Alicia Lisle had been executed. When the demoniac judge had done his worst, and came home again, he was particularly complimented in the Royal Gazette: and when the king heard, that, through drunkenness and raging, he was very ill, his odious majesty remarked that such another man could not be found in England. Besides all this, a former sheriff of London, name Cornish, was hanged within sight of his own house, after an abominably conducted trial, for having had a share in what is known as the Rye House Plot. And on the very same day a worthy widow, named Elizabeth Gaunt, was burned alive at Tyburn, for having sheltered a wretch who himself gave evidence against her. She settled the fuel about herself with her own hands, so that the flames should reach her quickly.

James hated the Puritan sects with a manifold and malignant hatred. He regarded them theological, political, hereditary, and personal foes, the foes of Church, State, and of heaven. When he resided in Scotland as viceroy he amused himself with hanging and quartering Protestants, and with

hearing Covenanters shriek and seeing them writhe while their knees were beaten flat in the terrible boots. While thus revelling in his cruel wickedness he became king, and extorted from the estates of Scotland the most sanguinary laws that were ever enacted against Nonconformists. From the day he became sovereign the fiery spirit of persecution waxed even hotter than when Scotland was under his administration as viceregent. Those places where the Covenanters were most numerous were given up to the license of the army.

Preëminent among the bands which wasted these unhappy districts were the dragoons commanded by one James Graham of Claverhouse. There is a story that these wicked men, in their revels, used to play at the torments of hell, and to call each other by the names of devils and damned souls. Claverhouse was the chief of this earthly Tophet. Inconceivably cruel and rapacious, of violent temper and stony heart, he has left a name which is only mentioned with the most malignant hatred wherever the dialect of Scotland is spoken. It would surpass the limits of this volume to enumerate all the enormities he visited upon the poor peasantry of the Scotch Lowlands. An instance or two will suffice to illustrate the bloody career of this wild and monstrous butcher.

The following is extracted from Macaulay: "The eleventh of May was signalized by more than one great crime. Some rigid Calvinists had, from the doctrine of reprobation, drawn the consequence that to pray for any person who had been predestined to perdition was an act of mutiny against the eternal decrees of the Supreme Being. Three poor laboring men, deeply imbued with this unamiable divinity, were stopped by an officer in the neighborhood of Glasgow. They were asked whether they would pray for King James II. They refused to do so except under the condition that he was one of the elect. A file of musketeers was drawn out. The prisoners knelt down; they were blindfolded; and, within an hour after they had been arrested, their blood was lapped up by the dogs."

"On the same day two women, Margaret Maclachlan and Margaret Wilson, the former an aged widow, the latter a maiden of eighteen, suffered death for their religion in Wigtonshire. They were offered their lives if they would consent to abjure the cause of the insurgent Covenanters, and to attend the Episcopal worship. They refused; and they were sentenced to be drowned. They were carried to a spot which the Solway overflows twice a day, and were fastened to stakes fixed in the sand, between high and low water mark. The elder sufferer was placed near to the advancing flood, in the hope that her last agonies might terrify the younger into submission. The sight was dreadful. But the courage of the survivor was sustained by an enthusiasm as lofty as any that is recorded in martyrology. She saw the sea draw nearer and nearer, but gave no sign of alarm. She prayed and sang verses of psalms till the waves choked her voice. When she had tasted the bitterness of death she was, by a cruel mercy, unbound and restored to life. When she came to herself, pitying friends and neighbors implored her to yield: 'Dear Margaret, only say, God save the king!' The poor girl, true to her stern theology, gasped out, 'May God save him if it be God's will!' Her friends crowded round the presiding officer: 'She has said it: indeed, sir, she has said it.' 'Will she take the abjuration?' he demanded. 'Never!' she exclaimed. And the waters closed over her for the last time."

It was thus that Scotland was ruled by this royal monster whose chief delight was seeing Dissenters swoon in the dreadful boots, drowning young girls for refusing to take the abjuration, and shooting poor countrymen for doubting whether he was one of the elect. James had industriously gone to work to change the religion of the country. This now would have been a desperate undertaking for a mightier monarch than himself. He first got rid of what was known as the Test Act, which prevented Catholics from holding public employments. He revived the hated Ecclesiastical Commission. He solicited the pope to favor England with

an embassador. He established convents in several parts of London, and filled the streets, and even the court itself, with monks and friars in the habits of their orders. He constantly endeavored to make Catholics of the Protestants about him, and when he could not persuade them they were removed, and their places given to popish adherents. In order to terrify the people so that he could carry out these measures, he kept an army of fifteen thousand men encamped on Hounslow Heath, where mass was performed in the officer's tents, and where priests went among the soldiers abjuring such as were Protestant to change their religion.

At last a spirit was aroused throughout the kingdom such as the bigoted blunderer little expected. A murmur of discontent spread all over the land, and was echoed from Hounslow Heath. James had two daughters, both of whom were Protestants. At length the queen gave birth to a son; and the new prospect of a Catholic successor determined the earls of Shrewsbury, Danby, and Devonshire, the bishop of London, Admiral Russell, Col. Sidney, and Lord Lumley, to invite the Protestant Prince of Orange over to England. James raised an army of forty thousand men.

The Prince of Orange accepted the invitation, and made vigorous preparations to cope with the English king. For a fortnight after Orange was ready to sail a great wind from the west prevented his departure. The wind lulled, and the fleet sailed, but it was dispersed by a storm and obliged to put back to refit. But finally, on the first of November, 1688, the "Protestant east wind," as it has been called, began to blow, and on the third the people of Dover and Calais saw a fleet twenty miles long sail gallantly past.

Orange landed at Torbay, in Devonshire, on the fifth, and immediately marched on Exeter. This was in the country where the Bloody Assize had been held, and the people, having lost heart, were slow to support him. But at last he was joined by numbers of the nobility, and an engagement was made by which all who set their hands to it swore to support one another in defense of the laws and liberties of the

three kingdoms, of the Protestant religion, and of William, Prince of Orange. The royal army began to falter. The greatest towns in England began to declare for the invader; and finally the University of Oxford offered to melt down its plate to furnish money for Orange. Then he knew that it was all safe with him.

James' most important friends and officers deserted him, and went over to the Prince. One night his daughter Anne fled from Whitehall Palace. The bishop of London rode before her with a drawn sword in his hand, and pistols at his saddle. "God help me!" cried the miserable king: "my very children have forsaken me." He resolved to fly to France. He sent his child, the little prince of Wales, and the queen across the river Lambeth on a miserable wet night. They got safely away. This was on the night of the second of December. On the eleventh, at one o'clock in the morning, James got out of bed, told Lord Northumberland, who lay in his room, not to open the door until the usual hour in the morning, skulked down the back stairs and slipped away in a small boat, sinking the great seal of England as he crossed the river. He mounted a horse provided for him and rode to Feversham, where he embarked in a custom-house boy for France. At length the suspicion was started that he was a "hatchet-faced Jesuit." At the Isle of Sheppy he tried to bribe the fishermen and smugglers who had crowded about him to let him go. They took his money, but held him fast. The wretched king then began to beg piteously for his life, and to cry over a piece of the true cross which he had lost on his ride. He was brought back to Whitehall, where he heard mass, and set a Jesuit to say grace at his public dinner.

England was now in an uproar. The people set the bells a ringing, lighted watch-fires, burned Catholic chapels, and looked about for Jesuits. While looking for Jesuits, a man who had been a frightened witness in Jeffreys' court, saw a swollen, drunken face looking through a window down at Wapping, which he recognized. He well remembered the bloated, beastly face of Jeffreys, though he was disguised in

a sailor's dress. The accursed judge was seized and taken to the Tower so that the people would not tear him to pieces. He finally died in the Tower.

James did not understand that Orange, and everybody else, wanted to get rid of him—wanted him to get out of England. And so one night he absurdly skulked down to the Medway, and got away to France, where he joined his queen.

The lords and authorities of London now met in council and declared the throne vacant by the conduct of James, and that the Prince and Princess of Orange should be king and queen during their lives and the life of the survivor of them. On the thirteenth of January, 1689, the prince and princess took the throne in Whitehall, and the Protestant religion was again established in England. James made a desperate attempt to make good his claim to Ireland, but the Prince of Orange again drove him from the throne. He spent the remainder of his life in France at St. Germain, where he died in 1706, having been king till 1688, or but little more than three years. It only remains to add that he was as profligate, stupid, obstinate, bigoted, and cruel a sovereign as ever sat on the throne of England.

Says Macaulay: "His understanding was singularly slow and narrow, and his temper obstinate, harsh, and unforgiving." Again he says: "Religious bigotry had become the dominant sentiment of his narrow and stubborn mind, and had so mingled itself with his love of rule, that the two passions could hardly be distinguished from each other."

Macaulay thus testifies as to his cruelty: "The administration of James was marked by odious laws, by barbarous punishments, and by judgments to the iniquity of which even that age furnishes no parallel. The Scottish Privy Council had power to put state prisoners to the question. But the sight was so dreadful that, as soon as the boots appeared, even the most servile and hard-hearted courtiers hastened out of the chamber. The board was sometimes quite deserted; and it was at length found necessary to make an order that

the members should keep their seats on such occasions. It was remarked that James seemed to take pleasure in the spectacle which some of the worst men then living were unable to contemplate without pity and horror. He not only came to council when the torture was to be inflicted, but watched the agonies of the sufferer with that sort of interest and complacency with which men observe a curious experiment in science."

His reign will always be remembered as a time of misery and terror. His barbarous excesses were mainly due to his fanatical zeal for his religion. Had England never had an established Church, she might have been spared the most deplorable periods in her history.

LOUIS XIV.

After the horrible scenes of St. Bartholomew (see Catherine de Medici) Henry of Navarre was obliged to make a profession of the Catholic faith to save his life. It will be remembered that he had been the head of the Huguenots previous to the massacre. Upon the assassination of Henry III. in 1589, Henry of Navarre succeeded to the throne. But he had to secure his claim by hard fighting and by the profession of the Catholic faith. Happily escaping an attempt to assassinate him, he was solemnly anointed king, at Chartres, in 1594, and entered the capital amid the acclamations of the people. In 1598 he granted to his former brothers in faith and in arms a measure of religious freedom and political security which has caused his name to be honored in the history of France. This is what is known as the Edict of Nantes, made in 1598. This celebrated edict gave peace to the Huguenots; and once more a period of progress and reform opened upon the prosperous realm. The Protestants inculcated industry, and ere long in every part of France grew up flourishing manufactures, and honesty, purity, and mental culture took the place of Catholic rule and indolence. In 1610 Henry fell by the dagger of Ravaillac, a fanatical emissary of the Jesuits. The period of progress and prosperity continued long after his death. The nation still continued to advance under the influence of the industrious, frugal, and generous Huguenots, and their schools and colleges inspired with new life the fading intellect of France.

Louis XIV., called the *Grand Monarque*, was the grandson of Henry IV., born in 1638. He was but five years old when the death of his father, Louis XIII., left the throne of France

vacant. His mother, Anne of Austria, became regent, under whom the famous Mazarin acted as prime minister. Of his long reign of seventy-two years, only an attempt will be made in this short sketch to give a summary of his persecution of the Huguenots. In 1651 Louis began the exercise of kingly power. At this period the most eminent men of the age, poets, orators, philosophers, and authors, belonged to the party of Protestant reform. Louis XIV. became a tool in the tyrannical hands of Rome. Guided by the counsel of the Jesuit, Pere La Chaise, he determined to win the favor of heaven by a total extermination of the hated Huguenots. His mistress, Madame de Maintenon, though herself once a Huguenot, contributed to confirm his malevolence, and grew rich by the plunder of the Protestant reformers.

The Huguenots at this time held in their hands the wealth, commerce, and manufactures of the nation. And now they were oppressed by all the malicious devices of the Jesuits. Their churches were torn down; their printing presses were destroyed; they were silenced, being forbidden to sing psalms on land or water; the only favor granted them was permission to bury their dead at night or at day-break. The Jesuits led Louis to revoke the Edict of Nantes, and to attempt the extirpation of the Huguenots.

In 1685 the Edict was repealed that had alone given hope to France. And now a scene of horror overspread the flourishing realm. The wise, the good, the pure and gentle Huguenots became the prey of the proud and persecuting Jesuits. The fires of persecution were again awakened. Every Huguenot dwelling was invaded by fierce dragoons, and such crimes were perpetrated by the savage soldiers of Louis as can only be paralleled in the persecutions by the popes of Rome. The wealth of the industrious reformers was wrested from them by indolent and cruel Catholics, and the most flourishing cities in France sunk into ruin. The whole energy of the king and the Jesuits was directed to the ruin of the industrious classes. Factories were destroyed, villages deserted, and great districts of the richest land in France became once more a wilderness.

At Tours, of forty thousand persons employed in the silk manufacture, scarcely four thousand remained. The population of Nantes was reduced one-half. One hundred thousand perished in Languedoc alone, one-tenth of them by fire, strangulation, or the rack. Louis was celebrated in the literature of this corrupt age as the destroyer of heresy.

Massillon, repeating the praises of the pitiless king, exultingly writes: "At the first blow dealt by the great Louis, heresy falls, disappears, and bears its malice and its bitterness to foreign lands." Bossuet, with rare eloquence and singular inhumanity, thus triumphed in the horrors of persecution: "Let our acclamations ascend to heaven; let us greet this new Constantine, this exterminator of the heretics, and say, 'King of heaven, preserve the king of earth.'" Rome rang with rejoicings over the ruin wrought in France. *Te Deums* were sung; processions moved from shrine to shrine; the pope addressed a letter to Louis filled with eloquent congratulations. Medals were struck to commemorate the fortunate event, and public thanksgivings were offered at Paris. A brazen statue was erected to Louis on the Hotel de Ville, with a brief Latin inscription, "To the asserter of the dignity of kings and of the Church." This was converted into cannon during the revolution, which were directed against the priesthood and the throne.

The flight of the Huguenots from France presents the most wonderful spectacle of heroism and devotion that occurs in the annals of mankind. The wise and good, the noble, the wealthy, and the poor, animated by a common faith, abandoned their native land to throw themselves upon the charity of strangers. Nor were the refugees such as a country can well spare. They were generally persons of intelligent minds, of industrious habits, and of austere morals. In the list are to be found names eminent in war, in science, in literature, and in art. And now all over France, great processions of men, women, and children hurried, under the darkness of night, toward the frontiers. The sorrowful fugitives made their way in strange disguises, and in fearful suffer-

ing and dangers. It was winter. The sufferings of the flying Huguenots cannot be described in history. Frail, fair women, nobles, and the aristocratic owners of great estates, left the luxuries of their ancestral homes to wander disguised over the snow-clad hills or through the wild and dripping forest of Ardennes in search of safety and shelter in the free cities of some other land.

A thrilling account has been given of the flight of two young ladies of Bergerac. Disguising themselves as boys, they set out on their wonderful journey through the wintry woodlands of Ardennes. Sustained by the anticipated joy of freedom beyond the frontier, they pursued their perilous way with a constancy unaffected by fatigue, cold, or hunger. They were seized by the rough, fierce guards of Louis, and their sex being discovered, they were dragged back to trial and condemnation, and shut up for the remainder of their lives in a convent at Paris.

The uncle of two Misses Raboteau put each young lady in a large cask, and put them on board of one of his ships. The brave fugitives reached Dublin in safety. Lord Castelfranc set out with his family in an open boat for England. He was overtaken, and three of his daughters were put in prison, and three other daughters and three of his sons were sent as slaves to the Caribbean Islands.

But yet no danger or severity could check the wonderful flight. With a constancy that never wavered, they gave up their country and happy homes to become wanderers wherever there was toleration for their faith. They filled the army of the Protestant Prince of Orange, fought in the campaigns of Marlborough, and founded flourishing settlements in far away America.

A dreadful fate awaited those who were arrested in their flight. The most of them were condemned to the galleys. The horrors of a life on the French galleys are too well known to need describing here. Night and day, through torrid heat and winter's cold, chained to a bench, nearly starved, and subjected to blows, curses, and unsparing cruelty,

exposed to the shots of the enemy, the galley convicts passed their wretched lives in the painful task of pulling the heavy oars, and then their bodies were flung ignominiously into the sea. The most noble, refined, and cultured people of France were chained in horrible torture amidst convicts and criminals of the deepest guilt. Marolles, once counselor to the king, was fastened to the oar by a heavy chain around his neck by the express order of Louis. Baron de Caumont, at the age of seventy, was put to labor in the galleys.

A general stagnation and decay settled over France after the departure of the Huguenots. Factories were destroyed, villages deserted, and the most thriving districts became a wilderness. Its industrial population had been slain or driven into exile. Paris became one vast almshouse, and all over the country men, women, and children fed on roots and grasses, and browsed with the beasts of the field. The Jesuits ruled the realm, and instigated the intolerant Louis to unexampled measures of barbarous severity.

The persecutions went on at home. Jesuit spies and the soldiers of Louis watched with restless vigilance the remaining Huguenots, and pursued them with vindictive vengeance. They were forced to hide their opinions in cautious silence, to study the Scriptures at the peril of death. To escape the evil eyes of the prowling priests, they held their secret assemblies on the sea-shore, among inaccessible hills, and in the solitude of caves and unfrequented forests. It became the favorite occupation of the legions of Loyola and Louis to track them to their retreats, and to bring to punishment the unflinching people who refused to give up their simple faith for the idolatry of the mass and the worship of Mary.

The *Grand Monarque* and the leaders of the Inquisition determined to destroy every trace of Protestantism in France. They tried to win those they could not conquer. They offered wealth, honors, the favor of the king and of papal priests to all who would consent to recant and betray the haunts of the hunted hereties. But not even the poorest mountaineer, accustomed to toil and privation, could be

tempted to abandon the faith of his fathers. With a constancy, wisdom, and moral purity above philosophy, he chose rather to lead a persecuted and precarious life with a calm conscience than to revel in ill-gotten gold.

Louis let loose his pitiless soldiers among the pure and simple peasants of the Vaudois valleys. The waves of popish persecution swept through the homes of the poor Piedmontese. The inhabitants were driven from their blazing villages to hide in caves and beneath fissures of great rocks, and to brouse oftentimes with the chamois on the wild herbage of the wintry hills. The well-trained troops of Louis hunted them in their wildest retreats, massacred them in mountain passes, starved them in the regions of the glaciers, and desolated the secluded valleys from San Jean to the slopes of Guinevert. And still they repelled the idolatry of the mass, and mocked at the pretensions of the pope.

The contest continued for generations after Louis passed away, and in spite of toil and danger, famine and death, the heresy of the Huguenots lived on, and the final consequences of the contest in the Vaudois valleys only ceased when the voice of Garibaldi proclaimed Italy forever free. This is the sad and instructive story of the efforts of Louis XIV. to destroy the frugal and industrious Huguenots. They chiefly constituted the working classes of France. A dreadful revulsion fell upon the nation in consequence of their flight. It was as if the manufactories of Manchester, Lowell, and Lawrence were suddenly destroyed; as if all the warehouses were closed in Boston and New York.

The exile of the Huguenot workmen was more injurious to France than the death of all its pampered priests and nobility, and the total annihilation of its Church and monarchy. And yet to-day it is taught in Jesuit schools and colleges, and believed by multitudes of Protestants, that Louis XIV. was a great and wise and magnanimous king.

It will not fall within the scope of these pages to give any account of his military operations, his political administration, or his domestic life, except to mention that it was such

as to call forth the censure of every historian who has commented upon it, and that it amply sustains the charge of his having been a most shameless sensualist.

And yet Zell's Encyclopedia states that he "was distinguished by high qualities of heart and mind," by "self-command and moderation." And notwithstanding he filled the galleys and prisons of France with the frugal and industrious Huguenots, destroyed the centers of manufacture and trade, and drove a large portion of the working population across the frontiers, Zell's Encyclopedia states that he "loved France, and did all in his power to develop the resources of commerce, industry, literature, and art." Every reader of the annals of that time is aware of the wide scene of disaster and national decay that followed the flight of the Huguenots and the massacre of the inhabitants of the Vaudois valleys. Indolence and vice, sloth, starvation, and idle superstition succeeded a period of unwonted progress. Swarms of monks and nuns took the place of honest laborers, and genius and thrift and honest industry were totally extirpated. In the last years of the reign of Louis XIV., France became noted for improvidence and crime, and bands of banditti ranged over desolate fields that had once glowed with abundant harvests. And all this was due to the rancorous bigotry of Louis and the spirit of St. Dominic that ruled him through his Jesuit counselor, Père La Chaise. "La Détail de la France," page 311, published in 1695, gives a clear and full account of the decline of trade that followed the persecution of the Huguenots. Weiss, i, p. 100, gives a graphic description of the depopulation of France. The above statement of facts is taken from Macaulay and from authorities cited by Eugene Lawrence in his "Historical Studies," viz., "Martin's History of France," "Hist. des Eglises du Desert," by Coquerel, "Mémoires d'un Protestant condamné aux Galères," "Les Forçats pour la Foi," De Felice, Smiles, and so forth. The truth is, the reign of Louis XVI. was like a miasma upon the commercial, industrial, and intellectual development of France. Death ended his life and reign in 1715.

INNOCENT X.

This holy Father made his advent to the Roman see in 1644. He was by birth a Roman of an old family. He had filled many important offices before his elevation to the rank of cardinal. His person is described as hideous, deformed, and disgusting; and his character corresponded with his exterior. Like priests in general, Innocent was hypocritical and treacherous, cruel, licentious, and vindictive; cowardly in danger, audacious and overbearing in success, and implacable in his hatred. At the time of his elevation he was living in incestuous intercourse with his sister-in-law, the widow Dona de Viterba. Such was her influence over him that she soon came to be known as "the Popess." Ere long this shameless woman obtained complete control of the court of Rome. By her command the Medici and her favorite cardinals were placed in possession of all the most important offices of the Church.

The first thing the ungrateful pontiff did after establishing himself in the sacred chair was to ruin the nephews of his predecessor, Urban, to whom he owed his election. In flagrant violation of the most solemn treaties, he pursued them with unappeasable malignity, made war against the duke of Parma, sacked the city of Castro, leveled its walls to the earth, and on the smoking ruins raised a column with this barbaric inscription, "Here was Castro." This enterprise and the elevation of his own family were the first things that engaged the attention of the new pope. But the real power of the papacy was in the possession of his incestuous mistress, the Dona Viterba. This was understood by all the cardinals and embassadors who wished to secure favor at the Vatican.

Their deference must first be given to the infamous courtesan. Her portrait was suspended by the side of that of Innocent in the apartments of all the dignitaries of the Church. Priests and princes obtained preferment and her protection by means of gifts or pensions.

The pope provided for his bastards by brilliant and advantageous marriages, He espoused his semi-idiotic son, Don Camillo, to Dona Olympia Aldobrandina, the richest widow in Rome. No sooner was the young Dona installed in the papal palace than she sought to supplant her mother-in-law by rivaling her incests with the pope. Frightful quarrels of jealousy broke out between these two abandoned females. At last they reached such a pitch and caused such a scandal that his holiness was obliged to send away his new mistress. But the disgrace of the young Olympia was only momentary. In a short time the pope himself recalled her to the Vatican and publicly granted her a marked preference over his sister-in-law. And then the women renewed their quarrels more violently than ever. Such were the disputes of these shameless prostitutes that the whole city became apprised of the outrageous orgies of the pope and of the mysteries of the gardens of the Lateran. Constrained to obey the orders of two ambitious and spiteful females who took pleasure in opposing each other, the holy father found himself placed in an insupportable predicament. Yielding to the solicitations of both, he would often prohibit at night what he had authorized in the morning.

At this time Germany was the theatre of a terrible war between the Catholics and Protestants. Duke Bernard of Saxe Weimar, one of the great captains of the day, commanded the Lutheran forces. He was too formidable a foe for the papal cause, but the Jesuits had the secret of taking off those whom they could not meet in the field. Bernard died of poison. Bannier, his successor in the command, soon met the same fate. Poison and the dagger have ever been the most potent missionaries of Catholicism.

Torstenson, the Swedish general, then became leader of the

Protestants. Escaping the cup and the dagger of the emissaries of Rome, he gained glorious victories over the combined Catholic armies, and obliged Ferdinand III. to put an end to the Thirty Year's War by signing the peace of Westphalia and proclaiming liberty of conscience through the whole extent of the empire. Pope Innocent became alarmed and fulminated the following bull against the treaty of Westphalia:

"By virtue of our infallible knowledge and the plenitude of our power, we declare that the treaties of Westphalia are prejudicial to the Catholic religion, to divine worship, to the safety of souls, to the apostolic see, to the inferior churches, to the ecclesiastical order and state, as well as to the clergy, its immunities, property, privileges, and authorities; we consequently revoke them perpetually, we declare them to be null, vain, iniquitous, unjust, condemned, reproved, without force and effect, *and we affirm that no king or prince who has signed them is bound to observe them, although he has engaged to do so by the most solemn oaths.*" The above is another illustration of the arrogated power of the popes to absolve from the obligation of an oath, however sacred.

But the incestuous intrigues of the palace left the pope no leisure to engage in the political or theological disputes of the day. His entire time was passed in elevating to power or hurling from it, by turns, the creatures of his jealous mistresses. One day his sister-in-law would hold the mastery over her rival and the holy father, while the next Dona Olympia would succeed by her lascivious caresses in undoing the work of the previous day and in securing the preferment of her favorites. It was thus that Innocent conferred the dignity of the Roman Church upon a lover of the young Olympia, to recompense her for having given him in the gardens of the Lateran a gaudy spectacle of naked females abandoning themselves to the games of Lesbos. But soon as his sister-in-law surpassed those outrageous orgies of his niece, he at once disgraced the former favorite and gave the post awarded to the lover of his niece to the lover of his sister-in-law. The latter now conceived another scheme for increasing her influ-

ence over Innocent. There was a young man of remarkable beauty, whom she had secretly made her lover. She presented him to the pope who was persuaded by her to give him the post of nephew. The consequence was very different from what she anticipated. The sight of this handsome youth served to excite the lubricity of the beastly pontiff. He installed him in a chamber of the Vatican adjoining his private apartment. He became the minion for the gratification of the unnatural passion of the pope.

The elevation of the new nephew was celebrated by public festivals and salvos of artillery. From that day the cardinal favorite directed at his pleasure all the affairs of the Church. This was far different from what the mistress desired. Instead of obtaining an ally against her daughter-in-law, she had created a rival still more dangerous than her, and made a minion that supplanted herself in her ascendency over the pope. She employed all the intriguing arts of a jealous and ambitious woman to prejudice the pope against his nephew. But instead of listening with his usual indulgence, Innocent became furious at his old mistress. A disgraceful quarrel ensued. She threatened the holy Father to unveil to Christendom his crimes and infamies, his double incest with her and her daughter-in-law, his amours with his handsome nephew, his shameful orgies and execrable debaucheries. Undisturbed by these threats, his holiness expelled her from the papal palace, and tranquillity was again restored.

At length the pope's bastard son, Camillo, the husband of the young mistress, became moved to violent anger, through jealousy, against the favorite nephew. The dissensions finally came to such a pass that the pontiff was driven to the alternative of losing his mistress or his minion. He retained the minion, and separated from his bastard and mistress. This circumstance afforded the sister-in-law an opportunity to return to the palace. She came back, again became a participant in the pope's debaucheries, and gradually recovered her former prestige of power in the affairs of the papacy. She presented to the holy Father a young man named Azzolino,

whom she designed to supplant the nephew by gaining the good graces of Innocent and becoming the purveyor to his pleasures.

Azzolino succeeded in acquiring such an ascendency over the pope that the nephew, foreseeing his approaching discharge, revenged himself by betraying the secrets of the Roman court to the Spaniards and Florentines. The treason was discovered, the nephew was stripped of the purple, driven from the Vatican, and into exile, after having tried to make his escape with six thousand stolen crowns of gold. And now the sister-in-law became, as during the first years of Innocent's reign, the real administratrix of the wealth and revenues and power of the Church. Innocent gave himself entirely up to his new passion for the handsome Azzolino. He no longer paid any attention to either temporal or spiritual affairs. All civil and ecclesiastical matters were referred to his sister-in-law.

At last Innocent X., completely exhausted by his lustful excesses, and tormented by the gout, was brought upon a bed of sickness. His intolerable physical sufferings were increased by the haunting fear that his old minion would poison him. He refused to take any nourishment unless it had been prepared in the presence of his sister-in-law. He would not suffer her to leave the room for a moment, and constantly held one of her hands clasped in his. His abominable existence finally terminated on the fifth of January, 1655. For three whole days his body lay abandoned to the domestics of the palace. It was finally buried by an old canon at his own expense, the incestuous sister-in-law refusing to contribute anything for that purpose. He had led a lustful, beastly life, and died abhorred by even his mistresses and minions. And thus closed the career of his holiness, Innocent X., the infallible head of the "one, true, apostolical Church" in the middle of the seventeenth century.

ALEXANDER VII.

The conclave which assembled on the death of Innocent X., 1655, was the scene of disgraceful strife between the French, Spanish, and Italian parties The final result of all their quarreling and intrigue was the election of Fabio Chigi, who took the name of Alexander VII. The new pope was born at Sienna, and was the descendent of a noble family. Through the influence of the marquis of Pallavicini he had been rapidly elevated at the court of Rome, and had filled in succession the offices of grand inquisitor at Malta and nuncio at Munster. It is maintained that in this last city the legate wished to traffic with his conscience and become a heretic in exchange for a rich bishopric, but that his demand had been rejected, and that in revenge he had thrown himself into the most ultra Catholicism. There is every reason to believe that he was one of the most consummate hypocrites and dissemblers that ever lived.

The Cardinal de Retz thus relates, in his memoirs, how he deceived the sacred conclave: "His honied tone of voice and hypocritical countenance imposed on all the cardinals. When the ballot which made him pope was counted he shed tears; at the adoration he affected to seat himself on a corner of the altar of St. Peter's, and upon the remark of the master of ceremonies that custom demanded that he should place himself in the middle of it, he did it, but with extreme humility. He received the congratulations of the sacred college with still more modesty; instead of replying to the congratulations, he went to sobbing in so grotesque a manner that those assisting could not restrain bursts of laughter, and said to him, 'Enough, holy Father, enough.' Finally, as I approached

in my turn to kiss his feet, he threw himself on my neck, and said to me whilst embracing me, 'Pity me that I have been made pope, and pardon the marks of weakness that I show, from the consideration that I am but a man.'"

He continued his hypocritical life until he had secured perfect possession of pontifical power. Then, like his predecessors, he cast aside the mask and showed himself to the world as he was. His first care was to promote the welfare of the members of his family. To his brother, Don Mario, he gave the superintendence of the Anona, and the administration of justice in the Borgo. He made his nephew, Fabio Chigi, cardinal padrone, with a revenue of a hundred thousand scudi: he chose another of his nephews, named Agostino, to perpetuate the race of Chigi, and married him to a Borghese, giving him as a dowry the magnificent island of Anicia, the Farnese principality, a palace on the place Colonna, and a considerable revenue from the apostolic treasury. He did not neglect a single member of his family, but provided every one with some fat benefice or very lucrative employment.

For whatever constraint Alexander had imposed on himself previous to becoming pope he now amply recompensed himself with the most unrestrained pleasures. Festivities, hunting-parties, and orgies took the place of prayer and the ceremonies of the Church. He left Rome and took up his residence at his luxurious country seat of Castel Gandolfo. He entirely vacated the Vatican, except to occasionally give audience to buffoons and licentious revellers. Says Guiacomo Quirini: "I served Alexander VII. for forty-two months. I discovered that he thought of nothing but wallowing in the mire of licentiousness, and that he possessed but the name and the vices of the papacy." He left entirely to others the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, only concerning himself with the free disposal of the apostolic treasury, which he used and abused so greatly that, in order to sustain his profusions, he was obliged to double the imposts.

Alexander had a passion for surpassing his predecessors by

his gigantic constructions. He lavished the revenues of Rome in raising palaces, opening streets, and planting gardens. To form the square of the Roman College he removed the splendid Salviati palace. He erected a colossal palace in the midst of the place Colonna for his family, and embellished the square of St. Peter by a magnificent monument, composed of two hundred and eighty-one columns and eighty-eight pillars. The enormous expense of these works obliged him to load the people with insupportable imposts and to grant unlimited traffic in relics, absolutions, and indulgences. His cupidity was so notorious that there was publicly sold at Rome a satirical engraving representing the pope, with his minions, mistresses, and cardinals, at the feet of an image of Christ, from the pierced side of which, instead of blood, flowed pieces of gold and silver, which the pope received in his tiara, repeating, in the form of a litany, "He was crucified only for us."

Father Oliva, the general of the Jesuits, sought to reconcile the people to Alexander's avarice and extravagance by preaching in all the churches "that all the actions of the pope were holy and meritorious, and that it was for the good of the faithful that Alexander and his cardinals resigned themselves to being rich. The rapacity of the pope was not confined to his own subjects, but led him to usurp the domains of his neighbors for the greater glory of God. The attempt to incorporate the cities of Castro and Comachio with the Roman see brought him into bloody collision with Louis XIV. of France.

The *Grand Monarque* swore to punish the presumptuous pontiff, and to go to Rome and burn him. In pursuance of this threat, his troops penetrated the Milanese territory in their progress toward the holy city, when Alexander, apprehensive of seeing Rome sacked and the States of the Church surrendered to fire and blood, consented to make reparation for his audacious acts. He signed the treaty of Pisa, and raised a pyramid as a token of expiation. A little later, Louis sent the holy Father a considerable sum for the canoni-

zation of St. Francis of Sales, and for the purchase of relics which he wished to deposit in the different churches of his capital. Alexander accordingly sent the brevet of St. Francis and three boxes of relics, carefully tied up with cords of red silk, and sealed with the seals of Cardinal Genesti, to whom was committed the guardianship of the remains of martyrs and saints. But the holy boxes chanced to fall into the hands of a bishop who was secretly inimical to the policy of the pontiff. This inquisitive prelate, with all the appearance of the most artless innocence, procured permission for physicians and anatomists to assist at the opening, in order to point out the parts of the body to which the bones of the martyrs belonged. This proceeding led to singular discoveries.

The anatomists having opened the first box, on which was written a legend indicating that it contained the remains of two celebrated martyrs, found the bones of three skeletons instead of two. The second trunk was found to contain, besides a collection of human bones, three thigh bones of asses, two of the inward bones of the legs of dogs, together with various other remains of bones which had belonged to different domestic animals. Finally, the third case, which, according to the pope's brief, contained the head of St. Fortunatus, was found to hold a death's head, perfectly resembling a dissected skull. But upon being thrown into a vessel of boiling water, the head of the saint at once lost its shape, and, upon further investigation, was found to be but a skull of painted pasteboard. Even the pope's legate, who was present, could not restrain his laughter at the ridiculous exposure, and the analysis of the sacred relics sent by the holy Father. The anatomists presented to Louis a full report of this comical piece of popish jugglery. The *Grand Monarque*, fearful of the ridicule with which this affair would cover him if it were noised about, flung the report of the anatomists into the fire, and forbade them from telling what they knew under penalty of being thrown into the dungeons of the Bastile. He caused the cases to be closed, sealed up, and distributed among the churches of Paris.

As far as Alexander was capable of engaging in anything beyond the pursuit of gold and his licentious pleasures, he contributed his feeble assistance toward advancing the general extermination of heretics, the prosecution of which then embrued in blood the cities of England and the provinces and valleys of the south of France. A sudden attack of severe sickness prevented the contemplated organization of a little massacre on his own account. It terminated fatally on the twenty-second of May, 1667, and the arch-hypocrite, Alexander VII., passed away to join in eternity the execrable pontiffs who had preceded him.

SAINT LIGUORI.

This eminent casuistic saint, founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, was born at Marianella, near Naples, in the year 1787. He belonged to a noble family, and embraced the profession of the law, which, however, he suddenly relinquished for the purpose of devoting himself entirely to a religious life. He received priest's orders in 1725, and in 1732, in conjunction with twelve companions, founded the association of the Redemptorists, which secured the approval of Pope Benedict XIV. in 1749. Besides the usual monastic vows, they bind themselves to labor for the propagation of the Catholic faith, and have for their principal system of action the conducting of missions.

Taking the horribly immoral doctrines of their founder into account, it is a lamentably significant fact that they have already ten houses in these United States—at Annapolis, Baltimore, Buffalo, Cumberland, Detroit, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, and Rochester. An independent organization, called the Paulists, was founded some years ago for missionary purposes better suited for this country, by some American Redemptorists, who left the congregation with the authority of the pope, and organized a first house in New York in 1858. A congregation of Redemptorist nuns, also founded by St. Liguori, but which never extended itself widely, has a house in Third Street, New York.

In 1762 he was appointed bishop of Sant' Agata dei Goti, in the kingdom of Naples; but shrinking from the responsibilities of such an office, he resigned his see in 1775, after which date he returned to his order. Having survived his retirement twelve years, he died at Nocera dei Pagani, August 1, 1787, and was solemnly canonized in 1839.

Liguori is one of the most voluminous and most popular of modern Catholic theological writers. His seventy volumes embrace casuistry, exegesis, history, canon law, hagiography, asceticism, and even poetry, and have been translated entire into French and German, and in great part into English, Spanish, Polish, and other European languages, thus injecting into the very heart of Europe and America the complex virus of pious fraud, perjury, doing evil that good may come, equivocation, and absolution of accomplices in crime.

Preparatory to his canonization, the moral system of Liguori had been more than twenty times rigorously discussed by the sacred Congregation of Rites, which decreed that in all his works, whether printed or inedited, not one word had been found worthy of censure: which decree was afterwards confirmed by Pope Pius VII. This Liguori is also Cardinal Wiseman's pet saint. Let us see what some of his doctrines are:

Concerning "The Seal of Confession," Liguori says: "This seal is an obligation of divine right, most strict in every case, even where the safety of a whole nation would be at stake, to observe silence, even after the death of the penitent, as to all things spoken in confession." Again, "It is asked whether the confessor, being asked concerning the sin of his penitent, can say that he does not know it, even with an oath. It is answered in the affirmative. Hence, what if he should be asked to answer without equivocation? Even in that case he can answer with an oath that he does not know it."

Liguori also instructs confessors how to deceive invalids or the dying, while acting in the capacity of God. And further, he maintains that "it is lawful to dissemble what is, or to cover the truth with words, or other ambiguous and doubtful signs, for a just cause." And we further read: "In Germany heretical things that may be done for a good cause are lawful." "To swear with equivocation for a just cause is undoubtedly lawful." "To swear with equivocation, without a just cause, is only a venial sin." "It is a certain and a common opinion amongst all divines that, for a just cause, it

is lawful to use equivocation, and to confirm it with an oath." "Simulation is useful, and on an occasion to be used." A false witness, and a man who in making a contract deceives another, by swearing equivocally, may be absolved, and neither is guilty of perjury. "An accused person, if in danger of death, or the prison, or perpetual exile—the loss of all property, the danger of the galleys, and such like—can deny the crime, even with an oath, by understanding that he did not commit it so that he is bound to confess it, only let there be a hope of avoiding the punishment." "He who hath sworn to a judge that he would speak what he knew is not bound to reveal concealed things."

Our saint also offers some practical suggestions on domestic virtue, viz., 1. How women may commit adultery with impunity; and, 2. How they may afterwards deceive their husbands. He plainly declares that "if a woman sacramentally confessed adultery, she can answer, 'I am innocent of this crime, because by confession it was taken away.'" "To the woman who, the husband being ignorant of the adultery, receives offspring, although she may fear to confess that to her own husband, penance is not to be refused." He then goes on to recommend the safest and most systematic means of encouraging profligacy. What an immaculate saint! He actually tells us that not only those who have promised marriage, but those also who are actually married, can assert to a judge, even with an oath, that they did not enter into either of these solemn engagements. Nevertheless, if a man has promised a harlot, with an oath, that he would not know any other, he is bound by that oath. Thus, we see that, between betrothed persons, and between husbands and wives, the obligation of oaths may be entirely disregarded; and that, in cases of adultery, a wife may use an oath to screen her own wickedness and deceive her husband. But the depraved fornicator is bound by his oath to a degraded harlot. After such a declaration, her scarlet ladyship, the Roman Catholic Church, cannot object to being called by the appropriate appellation of "Mother of Harlots."

Our pattern saint also informs us that the pope can exonerate an individual from any oath, no matter how binding. And he also declares that many oaths which an ordinary humanity deem sacred are of themselves null and void, especially if they are supposed to militate in the least against the interests of the Church, and ends his infernal argument by announcing that however valid any oaths may be, they can be relaxed by the Church.

To do evil that good may come: to permit a lesser evil for the avoiding of a greater one, are favorite maxims of St. Liguori. Thus, you may persuade any one who is determined to commit murder that he should only cut off the hand, and one wishing to commit adultery to commit fornication with an unmarried person in general, but not with any in particular. The reason is, because he that so persuades does not seek an evil but a good, to wit; the choice of a lesser evil. And our saint, for illustration's sake, endorses Sanchez when he says, proving his point from St. Augustin, "that if a man is about to do that which is not lawful, in that case he may commit adultery, and he may not commit homicide; and, though his own wife is alive, he may marry another, and not shed human blood." From which words, "He may commit adultery," Sanchez and others prove that the doctor not only was speaking of permitting, but even of persuading. And this, adds Sanchez, is lawful not only for private persons, but even confessors, parents, and others upon whom the duty is officially incumbent, to prevent the sins of those under them.

Liguori also most decidedly states that it is lawful to afford an occasion of sin, be it theft or adultery, or any other such heinous crime. And again, in his affirmative reply to the question whether it may be lawful to coöperate materially in the sin of another, our saint is not guided by the immutable principles of right and wrong, but makes a solemn league and covenant with sin and vice and crime, purely from motives of the merest expediency. For instance, he fully endorses the following beautiful piece of casuistry, namely, that it is perfectly lawful for a servant to stoop and submit his shoulders,

or bring a ladder, or force open the door, in order to knowingly assist his master in ascending by the window or in entering through a door for the purpose of deflouring a virgin, or committing fornication or adultery, provided said servant does all this from a fear of great injury, for example, lest he should be badly treated by his master, incur his displeasure, or be expelled from his house, or from fear of great loss, or death.

The altogether lovely subject of our sketch also teaches that it is allowable for a creditor to compensate himself, and for servants and others to steal; and he moreover furnishes a regular scale of thefts to inform thieves how much they may steal from persons in the various ranks of life, without committing a mortal sin, and then decides as to the quantity of stolen property necessary to constitute that same mortal sin. He also makes the amount of guilt dependent on the place in which the theft is committed, as, for instance, whether in or out of the district of Rome, and whether an insignificant part of some relic, or some rare portion of it, or some rare or remarkable relic itself, as, for example, the holy cross, the hair of the Blessed Virgin, and so forth.

We shall pass over this accomplished saint's disgusting inanities about juvenile, adult, and marital onanism as unworthy of a place in these pages, only remarking that he quotes a long list of divines who have written elaborate treatises on this most perplexing theological topic. Such matters, by the bye, appear to be more congenial to the tastes of Roman Catholic saints than almost any other subject.

Lest the confessor should indolently hesitate in tracing out the circumstances of any sin, another saint comes to the help of Liguori, and instructs him to have the following versicle of circumstances always in readiness: "Quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando." Who, what, where, with what assistance, why, how, when.

Our bachelor saint then expatiates on the carnal sins which man and wife commit with one another, upon their various possible postures and touches, and leers, and filthy words, and

other very delicate matters. We think very few of our married friends could compose such a masterpiece of matrimonial mysteries. We could fill many pages with this holy obscenity if we were ecclesiastically inclined; but being of miserable free-thinking stripe, we will mercifully spare our readers. But there are some things closely related to these matters which we cannot pass so slightly over. We feel in duty bound to fix the readers on this, to wit: that there is nothing done, it appears, that can escape the knowledge of the priest. He knows the secrets of young and old: he can tell the real father of every child in the parish, nay, the very attitude in which each was begotten, and the words with which each embrace was given, and the more prurient he is in his damnable inquisitiveness, the greater his right to be called divine, and to be canonized as saint so-and-so of most blessed memory. One of these vile fellows has actually declared, and he is equal in authority to our well-beloved Liguori, that the wicked wretch who invades his father's bed, and commits incest with his step-mother, is not so guilty in the eyes of the Church as the man who circulates the Bible. The latter is excommunicated with an excommunication reserved to the supreme pontiff, whilst the offense of the former does not constitute even a reserved case for the immediate superior; and even if this incest (and sodomy, for that) were liable to this simple reservation, it would not properly be a punishment, but a simple negation of approbation or jurisdiction. So nothing is so atrocious to the Catholic Church as poor Protestantism, not even incest or sodomy. How we Freethinkers are obliged to expand our heartless risibilities at the irrepressible conflicts of these ecclesiastical Kilkenny cats, so truculent, so implacable. Let them fight it out and have done with them. Only let them both beware how they claw at us, in these days of Freethought Conventions and Liberal League Congresses and Ingersoll's Lectures and Vindications. We are pretty strongly entrenched and fortified now, too strongly to be assailed all along the line with impunity. And if we thus feel our importance when mostly on the defensive, what will it be when, at

no distant generation, we shall be obliged, in the interest of outraged common sense, science, humanity, and civilization, to boldly take the offensive, and institute a beneficent Inquisition of our own, which, in its merciless abolition of ecclesiasticism and ecclesiastics, and its as merciless liberation of their dupes and slaves, will be as remorseless as the Spanish Inquisition, the Puritan persecutions, and the proclamation of emancipation combined, only ineffably more enlightened in its motives and humane in its methods.

A few more of our pure saint's axioms, and we shall have done. He says that conjugal copulation taking place in a church, if kept secret, does not pollute the church. He seems to be in great doubt as to whether the indulgence of the act at a great Church solemnity, such as the Passover, or on the day of communion, or when the wife is pregnant, or when troubled with the monthly terms, or when disgusted and unwilling, are, or are not, mortal or venial sins, or no sins at all. Enough, and more than enough. The reader will readily grant us his pardon for having thus, like an efficient and honest policeman, conducted him on a tour of inspection through the "Five Points" of Catholic saintliness, under the guiding star of the supereminent saint of our sketch. We have done it under a solemn conviction that he ought to know a great deal, if not all, about these things, so as to be ready not only to give a fair account of the faith that was in one of the great Champions of the Church, but to fully compare with this his own counter-faith in the world of reason, justice, and purity.

PIUS VI.

In glancing down the list of the long line of pontiffs, from the fisherman Peter to Leo XIII., the conviction is irresistibly forced upon us that the great majority of them were imposters and vipers of vice and crime. But one virtuous pope ever ascended the throne of the Vatican, and he was poisoned by Jesuits. Clement XIV. (also known as the "good Ganganelli") had as pure a heart as human being ever possessed; and he was an Atheist. This wise and worthy pontiff was the immediate predecessor of the subject of this sketch; and the amiable and exalted virtues, the purity and goodness of Ganganelli seems to give an added lustre to his spotless character by contrast with the infamous morals and execrable life of the perjured and perfidious Pius VI.

At Tivoli or Frascati, surrounded by foreign philosophers, who were attracted there by his hospitality, Ganganelli often indulged the pleasure of speaking without restraint. To these sympathetic friends he would say: "A pope is like every king, a mere shadow, conjured up by a powerful body of men; it is an idol they raise up to frighten a credulous and stupid populace; and well do they succeed with their divine phantasmagoria, for it enables those impostors to oppress the people with the iron sceptre of superstition. Such, my friends, are the effects of a system which was only invented to degrade man, and to retain him in the gross slumber of ignorance and error."

Again he would say: "The world knows how reluctantly I accepted a situation which was incompatible with my private feelings, my taste for poetry, and other innocent pleasures, and that I only yielded to the most urgent solicitations

I had formed many chimerical ideas with regard to the place I now occupy, deeming it possible for me to decrease the sum of miseries which falls to the lot of man in the same proportion that I would increase his sum of happiness; and these were the motives which induced me to accept the tiara. I had also resolved to overthrow Christianity—that is to say, idolatry; but watched by the sleepless eyes of a thousand Arguses and always surrounded by the apostles of error and falsehood, I have only been able thus far to hope from the very bottom of my heart that the time may soon come to put into execution this important reform. Obliged, although in opposition to my natural frame of mind, to assume a contemptible authority, I really blush to appear in Rome, in Italy, or even before Europe. I feel no less shame at the incense which a crapulous superstition lays at my feet, and at the homage paid to me as if I was a living idol—the living oracle of a fabled God."

His first act after assuming the tiara was to remove the ministers that composed the corrupt court of Rome, and announce his resolution to restore peace to the Church, and to reform Christianity. This carried consternation among cardinals, bishops, priests, and the monkish mob who grew fat in idleness on the sweat of the superstitious masses. A Jesuit posted up in open day, on the principal entrance to the Vatican, a placard containing these words: "Pray for the pope who is about to die."

Europe was again in danger from the mad schemes of the Jesuits. Ganganelli spent four years studying the secret history of the infamous society. July 21, 1773, he signed the brief for its suppression—sighing as he gave it his signature—"I have signed my own death warrant, but I obey my conscience." A few days afterwards the initial letters of a pasquinade were placed on the gate of the palace, which, interpreted, read as follows: "The holy see will be vacant in September." Apprehending poison, Ganganelli replaced the cook by a good monk named Francis, who, from devotion to him, consented to prepare the dishes for his table. He would

frequently caution the good Franciscan thus: "Brother Francis, watch the pot." But despite of every precaution the Jesuits attained their infernal end. The pope was passionately fond of figs. A lady of the Sabine had a tree which bore the best of this fruit in Rome. She was in the habit of furnishing Brother Francis, whose confidence she had gained, with the choicest of her fruit for the pope's table. One day she slipped into the basket a remarkably fine fig, into which a subtle poison, called aquetta, had been injected. The sinister prediction of the pasquinade was accomplished by the death of Ganganelli on the twenty-second of September, 1774, at seven and a half o'clock in the morning. The last sigh of his pure and unsubdued heart was for the happiness of his fellow-men. And thus, as if to demonstrate the non-existence of a God, the world was bereaved of one of its best benefactors by base and bloody priests. Ganganelli was the first and last pope whose life was above reproach, and who carried to the tomb the regrets and blessings of the wise and good.

And now the cardinals entered into conclave to elect a successor. The holy assembly was disturbed by the most disgraceful disunion. Competitive cardinals consumed five months trying to filch the tiara from each other. Sometimes they came to blows, and fell to bruising and battering each other. At length Florida Blanca, the minister of Spain, conceived the happy idea of gaining over to his side the mistresses of the cardinals, and thus cause the holy spirit to speak by the mouths of courtesans. The gold of Spain and France was lavished on these queens of the conclave. They in return, by secret advice to their lovers, secured the election of John Angelo Braschi, who was proclaimed supreme head of the Church on the fourteenth of February, 1775, by the name of Pius VI.

At this time Pius had reached the fifty-eighth year of his age. Born of a poor but noble family of the territory of Casena; taken early under the protection of Cardinal Ruffo, the lover of his mother, and advanced to high ecclesiastical dignities: first, private secretary to Benedict XIV., then auditor, and

finally treasurer of the apostolic chamber, one of the most important posts in the Roman government, Braschi was given the cardinal's hat by the good Ganganelli, notwithstanding some very serious charges which were brought against him. During the reign of his predecessor he lived a rather retired life, closely affiliating with Jesuits, conspiring with them and concealing them in his palace; and there are some reasons for suspecting that he was not a stranger to the plot for poisoning his predecessor.

He had chosen the name of Pius, "because," said he, "Pius V. is the last pope canonized by the Church, and I wish to walk in his footsteps." This circumstance alone is sufficient to indicate his execrable character. Proud, implacable, prodigal and pusillanimous, ambitious and coldly cruel, false in heart and knavish in mind, he only lacked the political genius of the ferocious Pius V. to complete the resemblance.

Gorain, the author of "The Secret Memoirs of Italy," accuses him of sodomy, adultery, and incest. All contemporary writers, except the stipendiaries of the Jesuits, agree that he led the life of a Sybarite, performing none of his pontifical functions, but abandoning himself to drunkenness and debauchery with his minions and mistresses, whom he chose out of his own family. He had two bastards whom his sister had borne him. He purchased for the youngest, who was called Romuald, the property of the duke of Lante, conferred on him the title of count, gave him magnificent equipages, and apartments in the interior of the palace. To still further show his unnatural passion for this handsome nephew, to whom he gave the names of Ganymede and minion, he sent him to the court of France with the rank of apostolic nuncio. During the absence of the young Romuald, the pope behaved as if he had been his most cherished mistress. He built for the object of his shameful amours a magnificent palace, and so steadily did he apply himself to its decoration that he brought on a severe spell of sickness, during which nothing could console him but the immediate return of his favorite bastard. Under pretense of concern for his uncle, but really

for the purpose of pillaging the purse of the Church, the nuncio hastened back to Rome. The convalescence of Pius disappointed his designs on the apostolic treasury: but he was created prothonotary, was made major-domo of the sovereign pontiff, and presented with several important benefices. The brother of Romuald, Count Louis, became in his turn the minion of Pius, and partook of his bestial caresses with his own mother, his brother, and a young girl named Dona Costanza, who was the fruit of the adultery of the holy Father, when he was but a cardinal, with the Countess Falconieri. In commemoration of this event, the pope conferred on his nephew the new title of Duke de Braschi, and presented him a precious casket which contained ten thousand doubloons in gold, besides rosaries, diamonds of inestimable value, a collection of medals enriched with precious stones, lands, domains, palaces, a part of the great property which the Jesuits had possessed at Tivoli, and the magnificent silver plate of this brotherhood, which had been confiscated. Besides all these, the two bastards received from the cardinals, Roman princes, the nobility, prelates, bishops, and officers of every class, valuable presents, and in such great abundance that they filled several halls in the Vatican. It was as if the pope had placed all Christendom under contribution for his bastards.

It was not long before Pope Pius surrendered himself to all the excesses of drunken debauchery. The Vatican was the nightly theatre of disgusting saturnalia, at which met the father, the daughter, and the two brothers, and which recalled the orgies of the Borgias. It was daily bruited about Rome who had been the favorites of the pope during the night, and whom he had chosen among his bastards, his pages, or the scullions in his kitchen. At length his holiness ceased to perform any of the pontifical functions. He passed whole mornings at his toilet, painting his lips and cheeks, perfuming his hands and breast, and bathing himself with precious essences, like the most coquettish of courtesans. He fell into a violent passion when his chamberlains did not dress him to his fancy. One day he beat a tailor nearly to death with his

fist because he brought him a badly fitting garment. Pius VI. finally became such an object of hatred and contempt to the Romans, that in the religious ceremonies in which he appeared, he only received hisses in exchange for his blessings.

A Milanese, named Amanzio Lepri, was the possessor of a large fortune, which he took pride in expending in pious works. Learning that this person was of an extremely weak mind, Pius proposed to use religion for the purpose of seizing on his great wealth. He sent a crafty old Jesuit to him, who raised doubts in his mind as to the lawfulness of his patrimony, and cajoled him into making a donation of it to the bastard of the holy Father. The sister-in-law of the fanatical Lepri, Victoire Lepri, protested against the gift of property which deprived her young daughter of her inheritance. She brought the matter before the tribunal of the Auditor of the Chamber. The latter, who was a mere creature of the pope, rejected her petition, and as the price of his conduct received the hat of a cardinal. But Victoire Lepri was not discouraged. She carried her case to the tribunal of the Rota. Fearing the result of the persistence of this determined woman, Pius proposed to pay her down one hundred thousand crowns, and to marry the young Marianne to his nephew, Romuald, provided she would desist from her pursuits. But Victoire refused to make any terms with the pontiff, and persisted in her resolution to have the donation nullified by the tribunal of the Rota. The judges rendered her a favorable decree, and set aside the act of donation. The holy Father, still determined to conquer his ends, extorted a will from the imbecile Amanzio, and then took the precaution to have him poisoned to prevent his changing his mind. On the next day he presented the will before the tribunal of the Rota, and demanded that his nephew should be put in possession of the property of the deceased. But what was his astonishment and rage, when, at the very moment when the judges were about to pronounce in his favor, he saw the young Marianne herself, led by her mother, advance before the tribunal and

unroll a later will than that of the pope, by which Amanzio appointed her his sole heiress, annulled the donation made in favor of the nephew of the pope, as well as the will which had been obtained of him by violence, and left to his family the task of avenging his death. The tribunal pronounced a second judgment in favor of Marianne and against the nephew of the pope. The obstinate pontiff refused to yield to the orders of the magistrates, and decided, of his own authority, that the cause should be reëxamined, and in the interval he brought into play threats and promises so appropriately that the auditors handed to him on a plate of gold the definite decree which confirmed the donation of the unfortunate Amanzio, and which condemned his lawful heirs to pay the expenses of the proceedings. This odious spoliation excited the indignation of Europe, and produced a serious rupture between the holy see and Joseph II. of Austria.

Leopold, the brother of Joseph II., convened a council at Pistoria, under the presidency of the bishop of that city, the famous Scipio Ricci, the nephew of the general of the Jesuits, who had died in the dungeons of the castle of San Angelo. The party of the pope determined to crush the council. It sent rioters into the city to excite the fanatics against the assembled bishops. The intrepid Ricci not only made head against the storm, but proceeded to investigate the character of the religious houses, the disorders of which had given rise to great scandal. He found that in the convents of the Dominicans, licentiousness had reached its utmost extreme. From the declarations of the nuns, it was shown that in the convents of St. Lucia and St. Catherine at Pistoria, the female Dominicans received their confessors in the chapter, and abandoned themselves to the most unbridled excesses of libertinage on the very steps of the altar. Other nuns confessed that frequently jealousy, or the inconstancy of the monks, led to serious collisions; that they disputed for the provincial or prior; that they deprived themselves of their money or effects for their confessors; that several

Dominicans had five or six mistresses at once, who formed a kind of seraglio: that at each promotion of a provincial in the monastery of the men, the newly chosen went to the convent to choose a favorite, and that the novices, entirely naked, were ranged in two rows for his inspection, that he placed his hat on the head of her who pleased him most, and made her his mistress at once. Scipio Ricci further discovered that these disorders were not the only ones to which the nuns abandoned themselves; but that they gave themselves up to the most horrid saturnalia among themselves. He placed these houses of prostitution under an inflexible supervision, and excluded the Dominicans from employment as confessors.

At this time the greatest events were occurring in France. A whole nation had risen to reclaim its forgotten rights, and to demand from royalty a terrible account of the disasters it had for fourteen centuries drawn upon it. Men and things, laws and constitutions, were all impelled by an irresistible force into the revolutionary whirlpool. Pius VI. combined his efforts with the infatuated Louis XVI. to cause civilization to retrograde, and to restore France to ages of slavery. The cause of liberty triumphed; King Louis was beheaded, and the throne of the Bourbons was dashed to pieces. This prompted Pius VI. to atrocious acts of reprisal. He organized bands of assassins, who, under the name of pontifical soldiers, abandoned themselves to frightful brigandage, and murdered great numbers of republicans in the name of the holy Father and for the glory of religion. The papal soldiers massacred or poisoned all the French who inhabited his States, and did the same towards the Italians and strangers who were suspected of being partisans of the new constitutional ideas. He confined those who remained indifferent in the dismal dungeons of San Angelo. He used all his pontifical power to promote civil disorder in France, and incited the legions of monks to renew the terrible religious wars. All the Catholic powers of Europe were hurled upon France to stifle the Goddess of Liberty in a sea of blood. Bassville,

the secretary of the French embassy, was murdered while going through the streets of Rome with his wife and children, and fanatical Catholics rushed through the city, shouting, "Long live Pius VI! Long life to St. Bartholomew! Death to all Frenchmen!"

At the news that the French were preparing to invade Italy, Pope Pius issued the following proclamation, in which fanaticism never spoke a more furious language during the days of darkness of the Middle Ages. "Italians, as soon as the stroke of the bell shall announce the entrance of the republicans on the territories of the Church, run all to arms, burn the harvests, poison the rivers and fountains; slay by every means, sword, fire, or poison, an unbridled foe, who mows off the heads of kings and priests with the axe of the executioner. Annihilate these barbarous republicans, who have sworn to overthrow the throne and the altar. Obey, all of you; it is your God, your pope who orders you. We promise plenary indulgences and eternal recompenses to the faithful who shall murder most of these ferocious French. We grant an entire amnesty to robbers, assassins, and parricides who shall redeem their crimes by fighting for religion: we give, in advance, our absolution to courageous women, who, like Judith, shall abandon themselves to the Philistines, and cut off their heads. Let all men who have received baptism hasten beneath the immaculate standard of the Roman Church: let all Italy rise with its millions of swords at the voice of the vicar of Christ, and let all men and women plunge their hands in the blood of the French, and taste the delights of this glorious holocaust."

General Bonaparte, then but twenty-seven years old, was placed in command of the French forces, and sent to conquer Italy. The most brilliant success signalized the march of the republican soldiery, and the military glory of Napoleon filled the world. Pius VI. purchased peace by the payment of fifteen millions of francs, by ceding the legations of Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna, and the surrender of the masterpieces of art of ancient Greece and modern Italy which

adorned the galleries of the Vatican. The treacherous pope took advantage of the time granted by the armistice to again embitter the fanatical population against the French by opening the treasuries of celestial liberties, and promising, in a bull, forty thousand years of indulgences to all who would aid in repulsing the republicans.

The companies of Jesuits again set themselves to work to stir up the spirit of bloodshed among the people. The usual means to move the minds of the superstitious were employed. In all the villages and towns the statues of the Virgin moved their arms, opened their eyes, and raised their legs; the crucifixes sweated blood and oil; at Ancona, St. Cyriacus uttered long bursts of laughter; at Rome, the skulls of St. Peter and St. Paul sang hymns; and what was most miraculous was, that in the presence of the pope, the cardinals, and more than eighty thousand persons, a Madonna walked, moved her head three times, rolled her eyes in their orbits, and uttered groans. These juggleries, executed by means of automata, alarmed the gross minds of the Italians, and raised the exasperation of the fanatics to its height. The armistice was broken off, the great Corsican led his army into the territory of the Church, and in fifteen days conquered half of it. His holiness at once hastened to effect a negotiation by the payment of thirty-one millions of francs to the republic, and the surrender of Avignon, Bologna, Ferrara, and Modena forever to France. Napoleon left fifteen thousand men under General Victor to guard the conquered countries, and marched on toward the Tyrol.

These constant shocks and his incestuous debaucheries with his daughter had given a fatal blow to the health of the pope. He fell sick, called for a confessor, and his two bastards hastened to Rome to plunder the treasury of the Vatican. The resources of the people had been already exhausted to raise the millions demanded by Bonaparte. Popular vengeance was excited at this new spoliation, and the bastards were obliged to leave the city. At this state of affairs Joseph Bonaparte arrived at Rome to claim the execution of the

treaties. In an instant, as if by enchantment, Rome threw off the stupor of centuries. Immense multitudes filled the streets and public places, and spread the tri-colored flag of liberty amidst the wildest acclamations and shouts of "Huzza for liberty! Huzza for France!" The old pope recovered sufficiently to order his sbirri to charge the people. These execrable butchers fell upon the citizens, massacred old men, women, and children, beat down the flying with their balls, and strewed the streets with dead bodies.

This conduct of Pius opened the eyes of Italy to his tyranny and turpitude. The people joined the republic. All through the Papal States resounded the cry, "Death to the pontiff assassin! Vengeance for the French, our liberators!" An Italian patriot expressed the wish, in a public discourse, "that the Tiber would soon roll its majestic waves amidst a free people, and that the blood of a pope would purify the earth from eighteen centuries of crime, shame, and servitude." General Berthier marched his troops into Rome, the people proclaimed their independence, and planted the tree of liberty before the capital.

As for the pope and his two bastards, the people, always great, always merciful, pardoned their lives, and contented themselves with taking from them their rich domains, the palaces, and the treasures stolen from the nation. The old pope was placed in a carriage with his physician, his steward, and his cook, and driven toward Tuscany. He was put in the convent of St. Augustine of Sienna, where he remained three months. Then he was transferred to the Grand Chartreuse of Florence, where he remained another three months. But the maddened old pope had not yet renounced the hope of being avenged on the French. From the depths of Tuscany he organized insurrections, and Rome again became the theatre of frightful massacres. Bands of fanatics, led by priests and monks, with a crucifix in one hand and a torch in the other, traversed the streets and public places; the French fell everywhere, assassinated by blessed daggers, to the shouts of "Huzza for Mary! Huzza for Pius VI.!" The

French directory, tired of the incessant efforts of the pope, now determined to transfer him to France. Pius VI. was taken over the Alps to Valens, in Dauphiny. His favorite bastard, De Braschi, had stolen his treasures and fled. This last ingratitude inflicted a blow from which he never recovered. The resources of his life were now used up by age, debaucheries, and excesses at the table. A paralysis, which had at first fallen on his limbs, extended to his entrails; and on the twenty-ninth of August, 1799, the earth was freed from the last pontiff, but one, of the eighteenth century.

CHRISTIANITY AND SLAVERY.

In the limited space left in these pages, a full examination of the origin and wrongs of human slavery will not be attempted. Some quotations will be made in addition to what has been previously said. It is an ancient institution, and was recognized and sustained in what are called the divine laws thundered from Mount Sinai. The slavery of mankind was recognized and authorized by almost every writer in the Bible, and there is nothing on record in the pages of that volume to show that Jehovah, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Jesus, Peter, or Paul ever wrote or said anything in opposition to the institution of human slavery. That they all sustained slavery is sufficiently proved by such passages from that sacred volume as these: "A servant of servants he shall be unto his brethren," "Servants obey your masters," "Obey them that have rule over you," "The powers that be are ordained of God," and many others that might be cited. Slavery existed in some form with the Jews as long as they had a national existence, and there has hardly been a Christian nation that has not recognized it and held human beings in slavery.

It is not the history of slavery in Asia and Europe that is to be entered into here, but rather slavery in America with the amount of recognition that it received from Christianity, and but little space can be accorded it. It will be found upon examination that American slavery has been in many respects the worst form that has been known, and that in all its deformities it has been sustained by the greatest leaders in all the orthodox churches, while its bravest and truest

opponents have been Infidels—such men as William Lloyd Garrison, Stephen S. Foster, Theodore Parker, Henry C. Wright, Parker Pillsbury, Gerrit Smith, and Wendell Phillips. The more orthodox the church the more zealously it defended slavery, and the more heterodox the sect the more it has been in favor of human freedom, and the more persistently it has contended against the fell and inhuman institution. The Friends, or Quakers, have been examples in point; they have been at all times steadfast friends of liberty for all, and the most heterodox branch of them, the followers of Elias Hicks, have been the most faithful friends of the down-trodden—the most indignant haters of oppression and injustice.

The leading principles of the opponents of slavery were:

"'All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"Slavery, or more properly, the practice of slaveholding, is a crime against human nature, and a sin against God.

"Like all other sins, it should be immediately and unconditionally repented of and abandoned. It is always safe to leave off doing wrong, and never safe to continue in wrong-doing.

"It is the duty of all men to bear testimony against wrong-doing, and consequently, to bear testimony against slaveholding.

"Immediate and unconditional emancipation is preëminently prudent, safe, and beneficial, to all the parties concerned.

"No compensation is due to the slaveholder for emancipating his slaves; and emancipation creates no necessity for such compensation, because it is, of itself, a pecuniary benefit, not only to the slave, but to the master.

"There should be no compromise of moral principle, in legislation, jurisprudence, or the executive action of the Government, any more than in the activities and responsibilities of private life.

"No wicked enactments can be morally binding. 'There

are, at the present time, the highest obligations resting on the people of the free States to remove slavery, by moral and political action, as prescribed in the Constitution of the United States'" (Anti-Slavery Declaration of 1833).

The opposition to human slavery was for many years one of the most unpopular movements ever introduced into this country. Every orthodox church, nearly every orthodox periodical, and a large majority of the orthodox clergymen joined in the crusade against the defenders of liberty. To show the truth of this proposition, some quotations will be given from William Goodell's "Slavery and Anti-Slavery:" "The first, collision, therefore, was manifested in the bosom of the principal religious sects at the North, including especially the Congregationalists of New England, and the Presbyterians of the Middle States, and speedily followed in the Methodists, Baptists, and other communions. The religious presses of these, particularly of the Congregational sect, in the hands of the conservative party, were the first to traduce, to misrepresent, to vilify, and to oppose the Abolitionists, representing them as anarchists, Jacobins, vilifiers of great and good men who had been slaveholders (but who had not been directly mentioned by Abolitionists), incendiaries, plotters of insurrection and disunion, and enemies of the public peace. By these artful and injurious appeals, other than religious elements of opposition were soon aroused" (p. 402, 403).

In giving the modes by which the struggle for freedom was opposed, Mr. Goodell uses the following language:

"To 'put down the discussion'—to 'silence the agitation,' was the evident object—and to a great extent, this design was openly avowed. The 'public indignation,' in some form, was to overawe the agitators, and overwhelm them with defeat. In perfect consistency with this, was the policy of closing against them the ordinary avenues of access to the public mind—the pulpit, the forum, the public journals (political, commercial, literary, and religious)—the arena of public debate. Or, if a discussion was attempted, inflammatory

appeals and injurious aspersions were substituted for manly argument and dignified debate. A colonization meeting or anniversary was the precursor of a mob against the Abolitionists; or, on the other hand, the riotous dispersion of an anti-slavery meeting prepared the minds of a sympathizing populace, with their gifted orators, for a public demonstration in favor of the colonization enterprise, connected with bitter denunciations of Abolitionists, and apologies or defenses of slaveholding.

"An attempt to hold an anti-slavery meeting in the city of New York, on the fourth of July, 1834, was made the occasion of a frightful and protracted riot. The meeting was broken up, and for several successive days and evenings the city was in possession of the rioters, who assaulted private dwellings and places of public worship, attempting and threatening personal violence upon Abolitionists. Similar scenes were enacted in Philadelphia a few weeks afterwards. Extensive damages were done to the private dwellings and public buildings of the unoffending colored people who had been cruelly maligned and wantonly held up to public odium at a colonization meeting a short time previous. During these riots, which were of several days' recurrence, many of the colored people were wounded, and some of them lost their lives.

"These early examples of lawlessness, notoriously countenanced as they were by men of wealth and influence, excited by eloquent orators, and palliated afterwards by the public press, furnished precedents for similar outrages thoughout the non-slaveholding States for a series of years.

"At Worcester, Mass., August 10, 1835, while Rev. Orange Scott was lecturing, a son of an ex-governor of the State, assisted by an Irishman, tore up his notes and offered him personal violence.

"On the same day, a mob at Canaan, N. H., demolished and dragged away an academy, because colored youth were admitted to study there.

"At Boston, October 21, 1835, a mob of 5,000 'gentlemen

of property and standing,' as the city editors called them, mobbed the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, dispersed them while the president was at prayer, and dragged Mr. Garrison through the streets with a rope about his body. He was roughly handled, threatened with tar and feathers, but finally conducted to the mayor, who lodged him in jail till the next day, to save him from further violence. After an examination, he was released from prison, but, at the earnest entreaties of the city authorities, left Boston for a time.

"The same day, at Utica, N. Y., a committee of twenty-five prominent citizens, appointed at a public meeting, and headed by a member of Congress, broke up a meeting convened to form a New York State Anti-Slavery Society, and threw down the press of a democratic journal that had espoused the anti-slavery cause. By invitation of Gerrit Smith, who, on that occasion, identified himself with them, the Abolitionists repaired to his residence at Peterboro', twenty-five miles distant, where, the next day, they finished the transaction of their business, after a portion of them had been pelted with stones, mud, and missiles, at Vernon, on their way from Utica to Peterboro'.

"In December, 1836, an anti-slavery meeting at New Haven, Conn., was broken up by some Southern students of Yale College.

"At Alton, Illinois, November 7, 1837, the press of the 'Alton Observer' was destroyed by a mob, and the editor, Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy, shot dead, receiving four balls in his breast. The murderers were not brought to justice.

"Pennsylvania Hall, in Philadelphia. was opened May 14, 1838, for the free discussion of all subjects interesting to American citizens. On the seventeenth of the same month it was burned by a mob, because Abolitionists had been allowed to hold a meeting there.

"At Cincinnati, Ohio, September 5, 1841, a ferocious mob destroyed, for the *third* time, the printing press of the 'Philanthropist,' a paper devoted to anti-slavery. The first of these outrages was in 1836. James G. Birney, a repentant

slaveholder, from Kentucky, was then editor and proprietor of the paper.

"At Philadelphia, August 1, 1842, occurred the worst of several mobs against the colored people of that city. A church and hall, built by their hard earnings, were burnt down, their houses demolished, and their persons beaten and mangled in the most ferocious and cowardly manner. The city authorities afforded no efficient protection till the mischief was done, in a riot of two days. The only provocation, on their part, was a peaceful temperance celebration of the anniversary of British West India emancipation, and walking in public procession on that occasion.

"These instances present but a specimen of the riots enacted against Abolitionists in almost all parts of the country. Not only in cities and large towns, but in rural villages and country parishes and townships, the attempt to hold a meeting for the discussion of slavery was, very frequently, the signal for a disturbance and breach of the peace.

"One uniform feature of these lawless proceedings has been that they have been either countenanced, instigated, or palliated by that description of citizens who complacently consider themselves and are commonly denominated '*the higher class of society*,' the men of wealth, of office, of literature, of elegant leisure, including politicians, and that portion of the clergy who naturally associate with the class just described, or are dependent upon them. The aristocracy of a city or village, and its mobocracy, if not exactly identical, or even if exhibiting the strong contrasts of splendor and squalor, were found to be the inseparable ingredients, the *sine qua non* of a riot against the claims of emancipation and the exercise of free speech. We speak of the general fact, not forgetting the noble exceptions."

In showing how the first religious periodicals of the country took sides with slavery, our author continues: "The 'Literary and Theological Review,' published in the city of New York, conducted by Leonard Woods, Jr., a son of Professor Woods of Andover, Mass. (himself afterwards professor of a college

in Maine), elaborately defended the position that the 'radicals' (meaning the Abolitionists) were '*justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures.*'

"The 'Review' was patronized by prominent clergymen in New York and New England, was approvingly quoted by leading religious journals, without eliciting a word of public dissent (except from the proscribed Abolitionists), either by the school of theologians represented by and in special sympathy with the 'Review,' or, what is still more remarkable, by the reviews and journals of the rival theological party, in the habit of controverting disputed points, against them.

"Another specimen of the literature of those times may be found in a widely circulated pamphlet from the press of a popular publishing house in Boston, the same year, from the pen of a titled LL.D., the previous author of a 'Political Class Book' for schools, that had gone through several editions. The drift of the pamphlet, of 1835, will appear from the following: 'It is to be hoped and expected that Massachusetts will enact laws declaring the printing, publishing, and circulating papers and pamphlets on slavery, and also the holding of meetings to discuss slavery and abolition, to be public indictable offenses, and provide for the punishment thereof in such manner as will more effectually prevent such offenses.'

"If it be thought wonderful that such sentiments could emanate from the high places of New York and New England, is it not still more so that no earnest remonstrance, either from press, pulpit, or forum, was raised against it, excepting only from the threatened victims?

"As early as December 26, 1831, Governor Lumpkin, of Georgia, gave his approval to an act of the Legislature of that State, offering five thousand dollars to any one who would arrest and bring to trial, *under the laws of that State*, the editor or publisher of the 'Boston Liberator.' By the laws of Georgia he would have been sentenced to death. Mr. Garrison was a citizen of Massachusetts, owing no allegiance to Georgia, but here was an attempt, by the Government of

Georgia, to secure his felonious abduction. Yet the Government of Massachusetts took no notice of the insult, nor in any way provided for the security of its citizens.

"Other public bodies and popular meetings at the South followed this example, and offered rewards for the abduction of Northern Abolitionists. Twenty thousand dollars were offered at New Orleans for the seizure of Arthur Tappan, and ten thousand dollars at some other place for arresting Rev. Amos A. Phelps. Another advertisement specified the names of *several* of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society at New York, offering a reward for each or either of them.

"Even ministers of religion shared largely in the feelings that prompted to these advertisements, and did much to countenance and inflame them.

'Rev. Robert N. Anderson, of Virginia, writing to the sessions of the Presbyterian churches of Hanover Presbytery, in 1835, said: 'At the approaching stated meeting of the Presbytery, I design to offer a preamble and string of resolutions on the subject of the treasonable and abominably wicked interference of the Northern and Eastern fanatics with our political and civil rights, our property, and our domestic concerns.' 'If there be any stray goat of a minister among you, tainted with the bloodhound principles of Abolitionism, let him be ferreted out, silenced, excommunicated, AND LEFT TO THE PUBLIC TO DISPOSE OF IN OTHER RESPECTS.

"'Yours in the Lord, ROBERT N. ANDERSON.'

"Rev. Thomas S. Witherspoon, of Alabama, writing to the editor of the 'Emancipator,' said: 'Let your emissaries dare to cross the Potomac, and I cannot promise you that your fate will be less than Haman's. Then beware how you goad an insulted but magnanimous people to deeds of desperation.'

"Rev. William S. Plummer, D.D., of Richmond, Va., in July, 1835, wrote to the chairman of a committee of correspondence for calling a public meeting of the clergy of Richmond, on the subject of abolition, in which he said: 'Let them (the Abolitionists) understand THAT THEY WILL BE

CAUGHT IF THEY COME AMONG US, and they will take good care to keep out of our way.' 'If Abolitionists will set the country in a blaze, it is but fair that they should receive the first warming of the fire.'

"A few days after the famous forcing of the post-office, the violation of the U. S. mail, and the destruction of anti-slavery publications, at Charleston, S. C., July 29, 1835, a public meeting was held for completing that measure, and ferreting out and lynching Abolitionists. At this assembly, the 'Charleston Courier' informs us, 'The clergy of all denominations attended in a body, lending their sanction to the proceedings, and adding by their presence to the impressive character of the scene.'

"The thanks of the meeting to the clergy for this service was expressed in a resolution for that purpose.

"Rev. J. C. Postell (Methodist), of South Carolina, some time afterwards, addressed a letter to Rev. La Roy Sunderland (Methodist), editor of 'Zion's Watchman,' New York, in which he said: 'If you wish to educate the slaves, I will tell you how to raise the money, without editing "Zion's Watchman." You and old Arthur Tappan come out to the South this winter, and they will raise one hundred thousand dollars for you. New Orleans itself will be pledged for it. Desiring no further acquaintance with you,' &c., &c.

"It was in the same year (1835) that the ministers and messengers of the Goslein Baptist Association, assembled at Free Union, Virginia, having adopted resolutions affirming the right to slave property, proceeded to denounce the Abolitionists as incendiaries and assassins, and intimating that they dared not show themselves at the South.

"At the anniversary of the American Colonization Society at Washington City (so late as 1839), Hon. Henry A. Wise, M. C., of Virginia, a slaveholder and duelist, said: 'THE BEST WAY TO MEET ABOLITIONISTS WAS WITH DUPONT'S BEST (*i. e.*, gunpowder) AND WITH COLD STEEL.' The N. Y. 'Sun' reported that, after Mr. W. had made his speech, 'Rev. Dr. Gardner Spring, of New York city, SPOKE WITH SYMPATHY

OF THE SENTIMENTS OF THE SOUTH, AS EVINCED IN THE SPEECH OF MR. WISE.'

"We can bear testimony that the language here attributed to Mr. Wise is but little more violent or reprehensible than was frequently used at colonization meetings that were attended by Dr. Spring (one of them in his own 'session room') in the city of New York, both preceding and after the riots against Abolitionists, in 1833 and '34. To 'silence' and to 'put down the incendiaries,' were expressions very frequently employed.

"Governor McDuffie, of South Carolina, in his message to the Legislature, in December, 1835, declared slavery to be 'the corner-stone of our republican edifice.' The laboring population of any community, 'bleached or unbleached,' he pronounced to be a 'dangerous element in the body politic.'

"Governor Gayle, of Alabama, had previously demanded of Governor Marcy, of New York, that R. G. Williams, publishing agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society, should be delivered up to be tried by the laws of Alabama (a State into which he had never set his foot), on an indictment against him by the Grand Jury of Tuscaloosa county, Ala., for publishing in the 'Emancipator,' at New York, the following sentences: 'God commands, and all nature cries out, that man should not be held as property. The system of making men property has plunged 2,250,000 of our fellow-countrymen into the deepest physical and moral degradation, and they are every moment sinking deeper.'"

Among the numerous instances of opposition to freedom on the part of clergymen and ecclesiastical bodies given by our author are the following: "Among the earliest and boldest attempts to suppress the discussion of the slave question in America, we have to record the 'gag law' of Lane Seminary, Ohio, October 6, 1834, by which the students were ordered to disband both their anti-slavery and colonization societies (for it was important to appear impartial), and, in a standing rule, forbidden to lecture, deliver addresses, or hold meetings among themselves, except of a devotional character."

"In showing the position of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the slave question, we have already noticed the declaration of its General Conference at Cincinnati, in 1836, in which they 'disclaim any right, wish, or intention, to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slaveholding States of this Union.' At this same conference a preamble and resolutions were adopted deprecating 'the great excitement on the subject of modern Abolitionism,' and the course of some of its members, as 'calculated to bring upon this body the suspicion and distrust of the community.' They declared themselves 'decidedly opposed to modern Abolitionism.' It was also 'Resolved, by the delegates of the Annual Conferences, in General Conference assembled, that they disapprove, in the most unqualified sense, the conduct of the two members of the General Conference who are reported to have lectured in this city recently upon, and in favor of, modern Abolitionism.'

"This resolution was adopted by a vote of 122 to 11. The mover, Rev. S. G. Roszell, was reported to have said, in the debate, that he wished the Rev. Orange Scott (one of the censured members) was in heaven; that is, he wished he was dead, in perfect keeping with the murderous sentiments so freely expressed by pro-slavery clergymen at that period, some specimens of which the reader has already seen.

"This same Conference received a friendly address from the Methodist Wesleyan Conference in England, on the subject of slavery, but refused to publish it. They adopted, moreover, a pastoral address to the communicants of the M. E. Church, in which, after stating that the 'Constitutional Compact' between the *States* precluded *Church* action against slavery, they added: 'These facts, which are only mentioned here as a reason for the friendly admonition which we wish to give you, constrain us, as your pastors, who are called to watch over your souls, as they must give an account, to exhort you to abstain from all Abolition movements and associations, and to refrain from patronizing any of their publications,' &c., &c.

"'From every view of the subject which we have been able to take, and from the most calm and dispassionate survey of the whole ground, we have come to the conclusion that the only safe, scriptural, and prudent way for us, both as ministers and people, to take, is WHOLLY TO REFRAIN FROM THIS AGITATING SUBJECT,' &c. *Signed by order and in behalf of the General Conference of the M. E. Church, by the bishops.*

"The General Conference represented both the northern and the southern portions of the M. E. Church, acting together. But northern annual conferences took the same ground.

"The Ohio Annual Conference had, a short time *before*, 'Resolved, 1. That we deeply regret the proceedings of the Abolitionists and anti-slavery societies in the free States, and the consequent excitement produced thereby in the slave States; that we, as a Conference, disclaim all connection and coöperation with, or belief in the same, and that we hereby recommend to our junior preachers, local brethren, and private members within our bounds, to abstain from any connection with them, or participation of their acts, in the premises, whatever.

2. "'That those brethren and citizens of the North who RESIST THE ABOLITION MOVEMENTS with firmness and moderation are the true friends to the Church, to the slaves of the South, and to the Constitution of our common country,' &c.

"The New York Annual Conference, in June, 1836, approved the doings of the General Conference, and disapproved the patronizing of 'Zion's Watchman,' an anti-slavery Methodist paper, edited by Rev. La Roy Sunderland. It also resolved that, . . . 'We are decidedly of the opinion that none ought to be elected to the office of a deacon or elder in our church UNLESS HE GIVE A PLEDGE TO THE CONFERENCE THAT HE WILL REFRAIN FROM AGITATING THE CHURCH ON THIS SUBJECT,' &c., &c.

"In 1838, the same Conference resolved that any of its members or probationers who should patronize 'Zion's Watchman,' recommend it, circulate it, obtain subscribers, or

collect or remit moneys for it, 'shall be deemed guilty of indiscretion, and dealt with accordingly.'

"'The Rev. George W. Langhorne, of North Carolina, in writing to the editor of "Zion's Watchman," June 25, 1836, said: If you have not yet resigned your credentials as a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, I really think that, as an *honest* man, you should now do it. You are bound to submit to their authority [the General Conference] or LEAVE THE CHURCH.'

"This sentiment, that Abolitionists ought to quit the churches or cease disturbing their peace by anti-slavery agitation, was very current in the churches of most sects, even at the North, at this period, though much has been since said against the sin of schism, when Abolitionists secede.

"Presiding elders refused to put anti-slavery resolutions in Quarterly Conferences, but readily put pro-slavery ones."

In the chaper on "Persecutions of Abolitionists" will be found the following: "Benjamin Lundy was repeatedly assaulted in the streets of Baltimore, and once brutally beaten by Austin Woolfolk, a slave-trader, before any of the modern anti-slavery societies were organized. Mr. Lundy was a feeble man, a quiet, unresisting Quaker, but the 'peculiar institutions' of Southern chivalry provided no protection for him.

"William Lloyd Garrison's imprisonment in Baltimore, and the violent assault upon his person, and his imprisonment in Boston, have been narrated already.

"Miss Prudence Crandall, a pious and benevolent young lady, established and taught a school for colored pupils, at Canterbury, Conn. Through the influence of leading members of the Colonization Society, an Act of the State Legislature against such schools was procured, and was enforced by the imprisonment of Miss Crandall, in 1833. The school having been resumed, was finally broken up by lawless violence in September, 1834.

"Dr. Reuben Crandall, of Westchester county, N. Y., a brother of Miss Prudence Crandall, having located himself in

Washington City to teach botany, was arrested and thrown into prison, August 11, 1835, on charge of circulating incendiary publications, with intent to excite the slaves to insurrection. After lying in jail above eight months, till April 15, 1836, he was brought to trial before Judge Cranch. The evidence against him only proved that he had in his trunk some anti-slavery pamphlets and papers, that the latter were used by him in wrapping up his botanical specimens, and that, on request, he had lent to a white citizen one of the pamphlets. The 'incendiary' matter read in court from these papers were articles against slavery, and in favor of the right of the free colored people to reside in this country. The effort to prove Dr. Crandall a member of an anti-slavery society failed."

"Amos Dresser, of Ohio, traveling in Tennessee to distribute Bibles, was flogged twenty lashes on his bare back in the public square in Nashville, July 25, 1835. His crime was being a member of an anti-slavery society, and having some anti-slavery publications in his trunk. Some church members assisted in the outrage."

"Captain Jonathan Walker, a citizen of Massachusetts, for assisting the escape of a slave, was branded with a hot iron in the hand, the letters SS, *by an officer of the United States.*

"Elijah P. Lovejoy was a native of Maine, a graduate of Waterville College, in 1828. He practiced law at St. Louis, Missouri, but, being desirous of entering the ministry, spent some time in preparatory study at Princeton, N. J. He was employed as an agent for the Sunday School Union, and was afterwards selected to conduct a religious paper at St. Louis. In this station he advocated the right of free discussion in opposition to the persecutors of Dr. Nelson. When a free colored man was burnt to death near St. Louis, he rebuked the savage outrage. For this he was obliged to leave the State, and located himself at Alton, Illinois, where, in July, 1837, he avowed his sentiments as an Abolitionist, and published a full declaration of his views in his 'Alton Observer.' This raised against him a storm of violence. Three several

times were his press and office destroyed, before the fatal catastrophe, and three times were they replaced by the friends of liberty and law. At a public meeting, early in November, ostensibly got up for the purpose of allaying the excitement, but really with the design to intimidate him and crush the liberty of the press, Mr. Lovejoy appeared and, in a noble speech, defended his cause and his rights, 'like Paul before Festus, or Luther at the Diet of Worms.'

"On the arrival of his new press, it was lodged in a stone warehouse, and here Mr. Lovejoy and some of his friends stationed themselves, armed, apprehending an attack, which took place the same night. After several volleys of firing, an attempt was made to set fire to the building. Mr. Lovejoy went out to prevent their purpose, and soon fell, pierced with three buckshot. His companions effected their escape. This was on the seventh of November, 1837.

"Mr. Lovejoy left a widow and children. His wife had stood by him, like a heroine, when he was brutally assaulted, some time previous, at St. Charles. When the mother of Lovejoy heard of his death, she said, 'It is well. I had rather he should fall a martyr to his cause than prove recreant to his principles.'"

"In the autumn of 1842, Mr. Charles Turner Torrey became editor of the 'Tocsin of Liberty,' afterwards the 'Albany Patriot.' While engaged in this work he was entreated by a fugitive from slavery to go to Virginia and assist him bring his wife out of bondage. He could not refuse. This undertaking was a failure, and they narrowly escaped arrest. It led Mr. Torrey, however, into other and more successful enterprises of the same character, but which, ultimately, cost him his liberty and his life.

"His arrest took place June 24, 1844. He was thrown into jail at Baltimore. Finding it certain that he could not have a fair trial, he made an unsuccessful attempt to escape from confinement. His trial came on November 29, 1844. He was convicted, as he affirmed, on evidence of perjured witnesses, who testified that they saw what they did not see.

He learned, what Judge Jeremie had certified before, and what has been verified since, that in all trials of this kind any requisite amount of false testimony is always at hand. He was convicted, and sentenced to hard labor in the penitentiary for six years. To this place he was removed the thirtieth of December, 1844. Great efforts were made to procure his pardon. His father-in-law, Dr. Ide, made a visit to the governor of Maryland for the purpose. It was all in vain. He died in the penitentiary, May 9, 1846, of a lingering consumption, the effect of his confinement. Such are the tender mercies of slaveholders. The God of the oppressed, the avenger of the widow and the fatherless, will remember them. The murderers of Torrey and of Lovejoy are alike guilty in his sight."

Rev. Joseph Cook, in a recent discourse in Boston, made the following truthful statement: "If the Northern Church had done its duty, the South would have had no hope of a divided North, and the war would not have been. Let not the Church grow proud over the fall of slavery; it was not her work. The Church could have refused to uphold secession in the South; it could have made slaveholding a bar to church membership, as the Quakers did; it could have given direction to the reform movement by putting itself stalwartly on the right side. United action would have prevented apathy in the North, and united action in the South would have made war impossible." He complimented Theodore Parker highly for the faithful services he performed in the anti-slavery cause thus: "Theodore Parker stood upon a high pulpit in Music Hall. But it was anti-slavery, and not anti-Christianity, that made that pulpit as high as Strasburg steeple. It was high because other pulpits were low. Parker was with God in the anti-slavery struggle, but the Church was not where it ought to have been."

Much more could be quoted to show the complicity between slavery and the Church, but it is believed that enough has been already given to make this point perfectly clear to the intelligent reader.

SINFUL CLERGYMEN.

THE limits originally prescribed for this volume have already been reached and it is found necessary to omit many of the criminal Champions of the Church, belonging both to the Catholic and Protestant divisions. Scores of the popes of the Church of Rome, hundreds of cardinals and bishops, thousands of priests, "Fathers," and clergymen who were guilty of decided crimes of varying degrees and blackness, will have to be passed over in silence, for want of room.

The volume, however, would hardly be complete without a chapter on the besetting sins of the American clergy of the present day. Licentiousness seems to have taken the place, to some extent, of the spirit of persecution and cruelty which ruled so generally in the Church two or three centuries ago. While from the effects of increased intelligence and civilization the rule of tyranny and persecution has become somewhat lessened, it does not appear that amorousness and sensuality have yet become obsolete on the part of the Christian clergy.

It is not claimed that clergymen are naturally more depraved than other men, as by birth they undoubtedly are not worse than the average of mankind, but upon a fair investigation it will hardly appear that they are better than their fellow-men, and that their "holy" avocation does not, in any great degree protect them from the weaknesses and crimes incident to poor human nature. There are good grounds moreover to conclude that those are not wrong who hold that the idle and often festive life of the priesthood is well calculated to minister to the passional part of man's nature, and that their frequent intercourse with the confiding and affec-

tionate portion of their folds aids in increasing their tendency to sensuality of thought and conduct.

This chapter is not given from any special fondness for this class of literature, but because it is deemed quite proper that this particular phase of clerical delinquincy should be duly placed on the record in company with the other crimes committed by their brethren in the past centuries. Of course but a mere fractional part of the licentious criminalities of the clergy are here given. Not one case in ten of this class of offenses are allowed to reach the public ear—"the good of the cause" requiring that information concerning them should be suppressed—and probably not one case in ten of those that are made more or less public are here briefly narrated. But sufficient, doubtless, is given to convince most persons that the religion which the clergy so stoutly maintain does not protect them from the errors and pitfalls which they loudly condemn. It is not claimed that all the clergy are as sinful as those here mentioned, but that too many of them are addicted to the sins pertaining to "the world, the flesh, and the devil" is sufficiently apparent to the common observer.

The following have chiefly been taken from current reports from the secular press, with some that have been received from private sources. It is believed that as a whole they are quite reliable.

Father Achillie was denounced in England by Cardinal Manning for the lowest licentiousness and filth. The Father denied it most positively, whereupon Manning sent to Italy and procured witnesses who proved such an amount of lewdness, licentiousness, and vulgarity, as were before seldom proved against a man. The pious man ultimately confessed all, but justified himself by claiming that he committed the vile offenses when he belonged to the Roman Church, where such crimes were the common practice with the clergy.

Bishop Armagh, Protestant, of the west of Ireland, was guilty of long continued sodomy with his coachman. Upon discovery, both were compelled to flee the country.

Bishop Onderdonk, of the Episcopal Church in New York, was deposed for being culpably guilty of lecherous conduct with many females, some of whom were wives of clergymen, in his library, and notoriously with his servant girls in all parts of his premises.

Bishop Onderdonk, of Pennsylvania, brother to the above, was convicted of similar conduct, and retired in disgrace.

Rev. L. M. P. Thompson, of the Second Presbyterian Church in Cincinnati, regarded as the most able clergyman in the city, was guilty of whoring and promiscuous intercourse with many females. He was expelled from the ministry, and after confession he united with the Synod at Buffalo, and was allotted to a charge in Jamestown, but soon fell into the same carnal practices, and was again expelled from the Church. He is now said to be traveling in Europe and acting as correspondent for a religious weekly.

Rev. T. Turner, D. D., President of the English Wesleyan Conference, about 1850, was convicted of the seduction of several servant girls. He left England in disgrace, and next appeared in Australia.

Rev. Ephraim K. Avery, of the Methodist Church, seduced a young girl and then murdered her. During the long, searching trial the church swore him through and did all they possibly could to screen him and keep him from the hands of justice.

Rev. T. Marson, of the Methodist Book Concern, 1840, was guilty of seduction, and disgraced.

John Newland Maffit, Methodist, a great revivalist, was widely known in the Western States. He talked and sung sweetly for Jesus, and pictured hell in its most lurid colors, and gave the devil his very blackest garb. His greatest love was for the dear sisters. In revival times it was a common thing for him to put his hand in their bosoms to see if they had the Holy Ghost, and to go home with some kind sister and stay all night. He committed adultery with the dears many scores of times and in various parts of the country. The lovely creatures deemed it a privilege to do for Bro-

Maffit anything he wanted. The writer has received many authentic statements of his antics with the sisters. A near and excellent friend saw Maffit on one occasion in the private bed-room of one of the leading sisters of the church at two o'clock in the morning. A bright fire in the vicinity brought them to the window and they exposed themselves before they thought. This was during a big revival, and the next night he plead for Jesus as earnestly as ever, and there was a great inflowing of the spirit.

Rev. E. W. Sehon, a great light of the Methodist Church in the West, long a presiding elder, and afterwards at the head of an educational establishment, had adulterous intercourse with a prostitute late one evening in his own church in Louisville, Ky. He was a very amorous man, and went it "on the sly" with many of the good sisters. Many charges of this kind were brought against him.

Rev. McCraig, El Paso, Ill., was guilty of *crim. con.* with a lady of the place and had to leave.

A clergyman of Detroit forsook his wife and went away with another woman. He resumed preaching in the far West and wrote back that he "hoped to meet his friends in heaven."

Rev. Mr. Wesley, Geneseo, Ill., ran away with another man's wife.

Rev. E. P. W. Packard caused his wife to be confined in an insane asylum because she would not believe that a portion of the human race were destined to burn in hell forever.

A Catholic priest of Evansville, Ind., was proved guilty of gross improprieties and immoralities with the young girls under his charge.

A clergyman of England not long ago was convicted of forgery and other criminal conduct.

Rev. Mr. Torrey, of the Conference of Western New York, was tried and convicted of holding assignations in his church. After prayer-meetings a select few of the sisters would remain, the lights would be extinguished, and several hours,

and sometimes the whole night, would be spent in sexual pleasure. A discovery was, however, made and the interesting game closed. He was removed to another field of labor.

Rev. Henry Brown, Methodist, seduced a girl in Texas under promise of marriage.

Rev. A. Quint, D.D., late preaching in a prominent town in Massachusetts, officiated for a few weeks in Plymouth pulpit in 1875, for Henry Ward Beecher. During his stay he was known to have adulterous intimacy with two fancy women on Fourth avenue in this city. He sometimes had them both in bed at the same time. Proofs of this can be produced if called for.

A well known D. D. and LL. D., for many years President and Dean of one of the leading theological colleges of New England, was in the habit of committing sodomy with certain students under his charge. He seduced for this purpose a pleasing young man, and the abominable practice was continued with him for sixteen years, and after the young man also became a D.D., professor in the same college. This unnatural intercourse practically unsexed the younger man and depraved his tastes. He married, but from consequent deficient virility growing out of the vile habit alluded to, his wife was dissatisfied and committed adultery with several of the professors of the college. This horrible case can be fully attested by a learned physician of this city, who gave the younger man surgical and medical treatment for the physical injuries he had sustained in that monstrous, criminal course of life.

Rev. S—— C——, D.D., of this city, was a well known whorist for more than twenty years.

There is now preaching in Brooklyn a distinguished D.D. whom a medical friend of the writer cured of gonnorhœa. The same medical friend has treated numerous elders, deacons, class-leaders, church stewards, and church members in almost countless numbers, for private diseases. Among this class he has known many more moral wretches whose history was too low and filthy to relate in the public press. Names can be given if insisted upon.

Rev. Mr. Allen, of Cincinnati, in 1865 and 1866 was convicted of intemperance and whoring.

Rev. J. S. Bartlett, Milford, Ohio, was guilty of criminal intimacy with a pretty married women of that town, who had no children.

Rev. Mr. Linn, of Pittsburgh, was guilty of several improprieties with the ladies of his congregation.

Rev. Maxwell P. Gaddis, an eloquent Methodist preacher of Cincinnati, a loud temperance lecturer and United States revenue collector under President Johnson, was guilty of looseness, whoring, and drunkenness. His wife was also a loose character, and had sexual connection with numbers of men. A pretty pair of pious saints, indeed.

Rev. Miriam D. Wood, of Decatur, seduced Miss Emma J. Chivers. Result, a bouncing boy without a legal father.

Rev. J. M. Mitchell, of Savannah, Ga., and formerly from Maine, was guilty of improprieties with females of his fold. When charged with the offenses, he stoutly denied them, and asserted his innocence; but when proofs accumulated and stared him in the face, he was compelled to confess to Bishop Beckwith that he was not only guilty of the offenses as charged, but that he had used the grossest falsehood in endeavoring to conceal his crimes.

The imbroglio between Rev. Dr. Langdon and Rev. Mr. Goodenough, and several other "reverends" of the Methodist Book Concern of New York, is well remembered, when charges of dishonesty, embezzlement, falsehood, etc., etc., were freely made against each other.

Rev. Mr. Lindsley, of Medina, N. Y., whipped a little child of his, three years old, for two hours and until it died. The excuse alleged by the reverend "man of God" was, that the child would not obey its step-mother and say its prayers. He was imprisoned at Albion, and came near being lynched by an infuriated populace.

A Methodist minister in Cheltenham, Pa., was boarding with the wife of one of the deacons of his church. The deacon had a blooming daughter of fifteen summers, with

whom the parson became so much enamored that his passions were greatly aroused. The mother of the young girl was justly shocked on a certain occasion to find the clerical gentleman in bed with her daughter. The pastor endeavored to explain the unfortunate circumstance to the satisfaction of the parent, by claiming that he must have got into the child's bed when asleep, but the story was not credited by the parents, and he was given twenty-four hours to leave the neighborhood.

Rev. Dick Bottles, of Meridan, Mass,, was arrested for stealing ham; but as he was a son of Ham, possibly he thought he had a right to it.

Rev. Charles A. Graber, pastor of the Lutheran church in Meriden, Conn., was accused of immorality and of improper connection with the sisters. He denied it, of course, but would not stand an examination, saying he preferred to resign his charge.

Rev. Mr. Wilcox held a revival of several days' duration, several years ago, in northern Illinois. He was loud and earnest in his appeals for "dying sinners to come to Jesus;" but in due process of time it was found that during that religious revival the Rev. Mr. Wilcox had become the father of four illegitimate children.

Rev. Mr. Dowling, Indianapolis, Ind., prominent among the Campbellites, committed adultery with his servant girl, and was seen in the act by persons from a higher window in a neighboring house.

Abbe Joseph Chabert, a prominent Catholic ecclesiastic of Montreal, and Principal of the Government School of Art and Design, was on September 25, 1875, arrested on a charge of rape, committed on Josephine Beauchamp, a girl of fifteen years, and in his own room. Probably his saintship had indulged too much in celibacy, until the flesh rebelled against the spirit.

Rev. John A. Hudkins, of Mount Airy, Ohio, was a bigamist, or rather a trigamist, having three wives at a time. He eluded justice by escaping to Canada.

A Baptist clergyman of North Carolina was imprisoned for bastardy. The fine assessed against him was paid by members of his church, and when he was released from confinement the sisters of his congregation met him at the prison door and received him with open arms.

Rev. W. H. Johnson, of Rahway, N. J., was convicted of stealing chickens, and was sentenced to prison for the offense.

Rev. Luke Mills, of the Methodist Church, Norwich, Ct., decamped with a considerable sum of money which had been collected for building a new church. He was also said to be guilty of irregularities with a female member of his congregation.

A well-known Episcopal clergyman of Covington, Ky., had several times partaken too freely of intoxicating liquors, so as to plainly show the effect it had upon him. On Christmas day of 1874 he preached a sermon in St. John's fashionable church in Cincinnati, and he was so fuddled with egg-nogg and communion wine, his preaching was so strange, and his language so incoherent that his condition was made known to all present. His mumbling became so senseless that the wardens made signals to the congregation, and in shame and disgrace they left the church and the drunken pastor to talk to empty benches.

Rev. Mr. Warren, of Busset Hills, N. Y., resigned his charge at the special request of his congregation, because he was the husband of three living and undivorced wives. He asked to preach a *farewell* sermon, but they would not consent to it. It was only leniency on their part that prevented them from prosecuting him for bigamy and sending him to State prison.

Rev. Mr. Deardoff, of Yates City, Ill., held a protracted meeting at that place, some time ago, and was one night invited by one of the sisters to go home with her and stay over night. Upon arriving there he began improper familiarities, and she not feeling in the humor for the like, and tearing herself away from his embrace, rushed to one of the

neighbors for safety. It is needless to say the protracted meeting came to a sudden termination, and the reverend gent proceeded to another field where the sisters were more accommodating.

Rev. Mr. Curtiss not long since conducted a revival meeting at Plano, Ill., and lived on "chicken fixings" and the best the pious sisters knew how to get up for him. Clerical business called him to the village of Blackberry, where he put up at a hotel and staid over night. When he retired he was so absorbed, either in the spirit or in the flesh, that he accidently got into bed with a woman not his wife. When discovered in the interesting situation by some over-curious individuals, he claimed that the little affair was entirely an accident. It is singular how many of these little accidents do take place.

Rev. Dr. Fiske, upon a trial for adultery in Michigan, unlike many of his brothers of the cloth, honestly owned up as follows: "I frankly confess to the fearful sin which I am charged with, and I will not be a coward to lie or seek palliation of my weakness and guilt. I have returned my letter of fellowship to the denomination I have so grievously stricken, and have abandoned the profession I have so deplorably shamed. I am not a coward or sneak to make Adam's plea, that a woman did it. It was was my own weak and unguarded soul that in a moment of frenzy and passion wrought my downfall!" This man was much more honorable and honest than a majority of his brothers who are tried for similar offenses, and insist "through thick and thin," in the face of positive proof, that they are perfectly innocent.

Rev. L. D. Huston, the clerical villain of Baltimore, was guilty of seducing and ruining several young, innocent girls, daughters of widows and other members of his congregation, who were sent to him for moral instruction. The fiendish ingenuity he employed in accomplishing his vile purposes was enough to strike one with horror.

Rev. A. T. Thompson, Methodist, Cincinnati, O., was

guilty of numerous criminal intimacies with married and unmarried females of his congregation, and also of gross intemperance. His conduct was of the most scandalous character.

Rev. Dr. Griswold, of Maine, of South Carolina, and of other localities, was a noted "ladies' man." His love adventures were numerous and spicy. He was also very found of jovial and convivial company. He committed bigamy, having two wives at one time.

Rev. Granville Moody, known in Ohio as "the fighting parson," served during a portion of the war of the Rebellion in the capacity of colonel of one of the Ohio regiments, having received a commission to that effect. He was a distinguished Methodist clergyman, and preached in Cincinnati and other parts of Ohio, both before and after the war. He was known to be an amorous man, who was very found of the female portion of his charge. More than one recital of his amours and love-makings have been told of him, but one will serve for the present purpose, and this occurred before the war, while he was preaching at Zanesville, Ohio: Mrs. Moody was in feeble health, and the parson had several female friends who took a very warm interest in him. Among the number was Miss Sadie Millis, a young lady of many attractions. She frequently called upon the parson at his house, on Market street near Eleventh, and spent some time with him; they were often in each other's company. These circumstances did not pass unnoticed by the observing members of the church, and were subjects of remark. On a certain forenoon Deacon Henry Howarter called to see the parson on church business, and seeing Mrs. Moody, he inquired for the parson. She replied that Mr. Moody was in the parlor with Miss Millis. The simple-minded deacon walked thoughtlessly into the parlor, at what proved a very inopportune moment. He caught the pair in the act of holding extremely intimate and criminal relations together. The deacon was thunderstruck, and stood in surprise. The parson was great in difficult emergencies, and with all the coolness in

the world he turned to the deacon and said, "Brother Howarter, let us pray." The three kneeled, and the pious parson poured forth so fervent a prayer that the good deacon almost doubted the evidence of his eye-sight a few moments before. A few subsequent confidential remarks from the parson convinced the deacon that for the good name of the church and of the parson, nothing had better be said about it. But in time, it being too good to keep, he told it to a near friend. The adroitness with which the parson closed the proceedings with prayer very naturally amused the deacon.

Rev. E. F. Berkley, of St. Louis, was guilty of criminal intimacy with the "gentle ewe-lambs of the fold." Among them was Ella C. Perry, of the immature age of eleven years.

Rev. Washington W. Welch, near Holly, Mich., committed a rape on Mrs. Louisa Green, the wife of a brother minister.

Rev. George Washburn, of the Lewiston and Bradford circuit, Alleghany Co., N. Y., was engaged in courting several young ladies at the same time, and was under promise of marriage to two or more of them.

Rev. William Holt, near Paris, Ill., whipped a widow woman with plow-lines.

Rev. Thurlow Tresselman, in Annetia, N. Y., seduced several young ladies of his flock; and when indications became so apparent that he was charged with the matter and about to be tried, he left the place very early one morning with the gay Mrs. Hurst, the wife of a gentleman who was absent from home.

Rev. E. G. Ribble, of De Kalb Co., Ill., seduced four young girls of the neighborhood and ran away, leaving his wife and two children unprovided for.

Rev. B. Phinney, of Westboro, Mass., was guilty of licentiousness with various females connected with his church.

Rev. Mr. Reed, of Malden, was in the same category.

Rev. I. S. Kalloch, now of California, while a resident of Boston, Mass., visited a neighboring village with a woman not his wife, and, hiring a room in a hotel for a short time, committed adultery with her then and there, as testified to

by an eye-witness. Mr. Kalloch, after this little affair, removed to Kansas, and for several years wallowed in the mire of politics: but not succeeding just to his mind in obtaining offices, he, for the second time, turned his attention to ministerial duties and pleasures. But, sad to say, the lovely sisters once more proved too charming for him, and he wandered in by and forbidden paths. He was hauled up before the church authorities for his peccadilloes, and finally stepped down and out for a season; but he soon again commenced imparting to his admiring hearers the will and requirements of God.

Rev. Dr. Pomeroy, Secretary of the American Board of Foreign Missions, Boston, was proved to be a liberal patron of houses of ill-fame, where he freely used the money his confiding flock had donated for the conversion of foreign heathen. By his own confession, he had paid more than six thousand dollars to women of notorious character in that city.

Rev. Tunis Titus Kendrick, of Brooklyn, was proved guilty of drunkenness and other immoral conduct. He struggled for a long time to regain admission into the church from which he was expelled, but did not succeed.

Rev. R. H. Williamson, Wilkesbarre, Pa. (pastor of the St. Stephen's Episcopal church), was guilty of visiting houses of ill-fame, and of other immoral conduct.

Rev. Mr. Smith, of Illinois, a few years ago drowned his wife in a shallow stream by holding her head under water.

Rev. Father John Daly, Catholic, Montgomery, Mo., seduced a young girl nineteen years of age, named Lizzie McDonnell, whose mother had been housekeeper for the priest for a long time. After getting her in a condition to soon become a mother he procured an abortion for her. The congregation were much excited in consequence, while a portion of the church authorities did all they could to smother the reports.

Rev. Archibald Hines, Knoxville, Tenn., was charged with stealing fifty cents from a bowl in the cupboard of one of his

parishioners, and it caused a great excitement among the saints.

Rev. T. M. Dawson, Brooklyn, Cal., left that locality and went to Nevada, leaving a number of his brethren in arrears —in the aggregate several thousands of dollars—he having invested for them in mining stocks. He was also divorced from his wife on the ground of desertion.

Rev. George O. Eddy was deposed for bigamy at Gloversville, N. Y.

Rev. Mr. Edgerton, same place, was afterwards charged with theft. He boarded at the Mansion House, and a servant found a quantity of stolen towels, napkins, etc., in a satchel in his room. He was arrested, and he left his watch in payment for his board bill.

Rev. L. T. Hardy, a Baptist elder, in Shelbyville, Ky., had a fall from decency. He eloped with one of the sisters of his congregation, and her brother pursued the pair in hot haste.

Rev. J. A. Davidson, once State lecturer for the Grand Lodge of Good Templars of Pennsylvania, was arrested at Erie for drunkenness and disorderly conduct and had a fine to pay. He is said to have organized more lodges than any other person in the State.

Rev. J. M. Porter, Bethlehem, N. J., was deposed from the ministry and Christian fellowship by an ecclesiastical council for gross immorality in connection with sisters of the Church.

Elder Sands, of the Baptist church in Hoosiek, N. Y., formerly an insurance agent in New York, was charged with "naughty" conduct with a ewe-lamb of his flock. He paid frequent visits to her, and one day her brother surprised them in very suspicious relations together. An investigating committee was appointed to inquire into the case. The girl was entirely mum, and had no communication to make on the subject. The elder confessed to having committed improprieties with the young lady, but did not deem it necessary to divulge all his conduct. The affair, however, was smoothed over and hushed up, and the gay Lothario went on breaking the bread of life to the faithful.

Rev. G. W. Porter, Methodist, recently had a trial at Danbyborough, Vt., for adultery with Miss Hattie Allen. The young lady was on the witness stand nine hours, and made a clean breast of the affair, making the preacher's guilt most apparent to all present.

Rev. John W. Hanna, presiding elder, and the most prominent Methodist preacher in the State of Tennessee, and one of the ablest lights in the Episcopal Church South, had recently, in Murfreesboro, Tenn., a trial before a Church investigating committee, consisting of Bishop McTyeirie and five prominent clergymen, for gross immorality in writing a lascivious letter to Miss Parilla Nailor, for trying to seduce her from the path of virtue and to yield herself to his lustful embrace. In his amorous suit he directed the attention of the young lady to the seventh chapter of Solomon's Songs, hoping the sensuous character of that portion of "God's Word" would aid him in his unholy enterprise. Fortunately, the young lady's brother intercepted the base letter and detected the hoary, clerical lecher. Upon exposure he became very penitent, and acknowledged, in great sorrow, his criminal folly. The love of Jesus, in his case, was altogether insufficient to keep him pure and upright.

Rev. John S. Glendenning, of Jersey City, N. J., it will be remembered, had a long trial for the seduction of Mary E. Pomeroy, who deposed, with her dying breath, that he was the father of her child and that he had seduced her. Although the clergyman boldly and persistently asserted his innocence, the public were satisfied that he was a basely guilty man. He subsequently removed to Henry county, Illinois, and preached to the faithful there.

Rev. W. H. Butler, pastor of St. Luke's church (Lutheran), of New York, was arraigned before the church authorities for deceiving a young lady under promise of marriage. He was requested to resign, which he had the good sense to do.

Rev. Austin Hutchinson, of Vermont, was charged by his own daughter, Ida, with being the father of her babe five months old, she asserting the fact with great persistency.

Rev. L. L. Copeland, of Vermont, a revivalist of some note, was denounced as a rascal. The credentials upon which he entered the ministry, even, were pronounced forgeries, and he was accused of being a swindler and a bigamist.

Rev. J. H. Todd, of Sioux City, Iowa, played an unmanly trick upon his wife. While she was mending his pants he slipped out of the house and eloped with a milliner.

Rev. A. B. Burdick, of River Point, R. I., was guilty of improprieties of a social character with female lambs of his flock. Eight witnesses testified pointedly against him, his guilt was unmistakably established, and he was compelled to "step down and out."

Rev. K. N. Wright and Rev. Mr. Kristeller both contested for the same pulpit at Newbridge, N. Y. The first had preached there a year, and was opposed to leaving. The second was appointed by the Conference to succeed him. The first refused to vacate; hence the quarrel. The Church divided as to the two claimants, some joining one side and some the other. The quarrel waxed very warm until the saints shook their fists at each other in a very ungodly manner.

Rev. A. W. Torrey, Kalamazoo, Mich., was tried by the Church for falsehood, and found guilty.

Rev. Mr. Coleman, of the M. E. Church, in E. Janesville Circuit, Iowa, was held in $5,000 bonds for committing a rape on a girl thirteen years old.

Rev. Mr. Parshall, Oakland, Cal., was tried by a church council for lascivious conduct with sisters of the congregation. He was convicted and left town.

Rev. John Hutchinson, Episcopal, Boston, was sent to the house of correction for eight months, for swindling George Allen out of a thousand dollars.

Rev. A. W. Eastman, West Cornwall, Ohio, was expelled from the Baptist Church for immorality.

Another Baptist clergyman, at Sabin, Mich., was detected in too much familiarity with some of the sisters, and ran away to avoid the shame of exposure.

Rev. Wm. Rice, Methodist, Mason, Mich., was convicted of adultery.

A pious "reverend" in Warren, McComb Co., Mich., was charged with violating a dozen school girls and swearing them to secrecy on the crucifix of the church. He ran away to escape exposure.

Rev. D. M. White, Presbyterian, Pittsburgh, Pa., was sent to State prison for two years for stealing money.

Rev. D. S. K. Rine, same place, was charged by a young woman with sexual irregularities.

Rev. Dr. Wm. G. Murray, rector of the Central church, Baltimore, got drunk and was extremely profane.

Rev. A. Steelson plead guilty to the charge of too much intimacy with the sisters.

Rev. James Reedsdolph, Methodist, Adrian, Mich., was sent to the Detroit house of correction for sixty days, for false pretenses and getting drunk.

Rev. Mr. Reynolds, Muhlenburg Co., Ky., brutally and repeatedly whipped his daughter, eighteen years of age, to force her to marry a man she did not love.

Rev. Hiram Meeker, Granville, N. Y., was convicted of fornication and adultery.

Rev. H. Foster, Circleville, Ohio, was compelled to marry his servant girl whom he had seduced.

Rev. John Seeley Watson, Kansas, murdered his wife.

Rev. Mr. Johnson, Williamson Co., Tenn., seduced a girl fourteen years of age.

Rev. E. S. Whipple, Baptist, of Hilsdale College, Mich., seduced a deacon's wife, and when charged with the crime was compelled to confess it. He afterwards prayed with the deacon and his wife. The deacon must have enjoyed that.

Rev. Richard Dunlap, Baptist, Midland, Mich., was convicted of adultery with a Mrs. Burnett.

Rev. Mr. Davis, same denomination, was arraigned for adultery with sister Brunk.

Rev. Mr. Kirby, Chambersburg, Ohio, was fined $200 for seduction.

Rev. Malcolm Clark, superintendent of the Sunday-school, Howard, Mich., ran away with $400 belonging to his mother-in-law, and also forged her name to obtain other money.

Rev. Mr. White, Washington, Pa., was found guilty of seduction.

Rev. J. H. Rose, Baptist, Hartford, Mich., was guilty of forgery.

Rev. Jay H. Fairchild, leading Congregational clergyman of Boston, after honorable service in the pulpit many years, was guilty of intercourse with the sisters. Left Boston, went to Exeter, was tried for seduction. Confessed that he had bound the young girl by a solemn oath not to divulge that she ever knew him. He attempted to preach again in Boston but was not successful; was charged by the public press with the crime; brought suit for libel, and upon full examination of the case was defeated.

Rev. Dr. Fay, a very eminent divine of Boston for over twenty-five years, had been esteemed and beloved by his church; committed fornication and adultery; was charged with it; denied it and swore that he was innocent. A church committee examined the case, were disposed to clear him; were about to report him innocent, when one of them, Dr. Hooper, said he could not sign the report, and proposed to adjourn for a fuller examination. When Dr. Fay heard this he begged them not to adjourn: said he had a communication to present, when he confessed his crime in full.

Rev. Mr. Strasburg, First Presbyterian church at Albany, N. Y., large congregation of influential citizens and those connected with State government, an able, eloquent, and popular preacher. Accused of debauchery, herding with negroes, and of the lowest and dirtiest conduct. Was put on trial, found guilty, and deposed.

Rev. Mr. Southard, son of Senator Southard from New Jersey, was founder of the Calvary Episcopal church in New York; accused of gross immoralities. The church tried to shield him, but his character was deemed so base that

he could not continue preaching there; went to Newark and founded the "Home of Prayer:" was kicked out, and went South, dividing his time while there, between the pulpit and low dens of prostitution in Southern cities. He died drunk in a low brothel in New Orleans.

Rev. Augustus Doolittle (or St. Clair, as he sometimes called himself), preached at Hoosic Falls, and was accused of unlawful intimacy with a wife of one of the deacons of his church. Was first charged with the guilt by a single person, who was beset and persecuted. Additional proofs came to light, and after several months the seductive saint confessed in full that the crime had been committed by him on numerous occasions for several years.

Prof. Webster, a pious Christian, connected with the leading universities of Boston, murdered Dr. Parkman, etc. Denied his crime most persistently, but the jury had sufficient proofs to find him guilty, and he was duly executed.

The Rev. Dr. Reed, Congregational, Malden, Mass., was guilty of most heinous crimes with youths of both sexes, and even children. Was proved guilty of most disgusting and revolting crimes.

Rev. Mr. Pomeroy, Congregational, preached in a fashionable church in Bangor, Me. Was Secretary of American Board, a position of high honor and trust. Was followed to houses of ill-fame in Boston, in New York, and in cities of the West. Denied that he was guilty of any impropriety, but claimed that he visited those places to reform the sinful inmates. He was charged, tried, condemned, and deposed.

Rev. Charles Rich, from Boston, was settled over a most respectable church in Washington—the one in which Dr. Sunderland preached for several years afterwards. He was convicted of immoralities and indecencies unfit to be named, and died in disgrace.

Rev. Mr. Thompson, Presbyterian, who preached in Buffalo, and afterwards in Arch street, Philadelphia, was over and over again charged with adultery. Was tried several times, but managed, through the sharp practice of friends, to escape.

Rev. Mr. Johnson, of the "Evangelist," a very pious man, a loud advocate of temperance, was several times seen in the third tier of the theatre drinking with low prostitutes and acting disgracefully. He was tried and deposed in dishonor.

Rev. Dr. Magoon, president of Jones College, a Congregational institution, was guilty of very licentious conduct with females of his congregation. He was tried, convicted, and deposed. But, after confessing and humbling himself, was taken back into fellowship and set to preaching again.

Rev. Horace C. Taylor, one of the chiefs of the Church at Oberlin, O., was guilty of seduction, was tried, convicted, and imprisoned. Was afterwards restored to the ministry, but he fell again, and was more sinful than before.

Rev. Richard Fink, of Grand Rapids, Mich., was, in 1874, found guilty of adultery with a young sister of his church. He was eloquent, popular, and highly esteemed. The case was so plain against him that he readily resigned.

Rev. Joseph Stillim, Winchester, Pa., was charged with ruining a young lady, Miss Sarah Hall, who stood high in the society of that locality. The great disgrace rendered her insane, but in her lucid moments she averred that the reverend gentleman quoted Scripture to her to prove that his conduct was in keeping with the word of God.

Father Forham, of the Catholic Church, Chicago, was charged with and tried for embezzling several thousand dollars that belonged to the Church. He claimed that a part of the money was won by gambling in a church fair, that there was no legal owner of it, and that he had as much right to it as any one. He was held in $5.000 bail.

Rev. Alfred N. Gilbert, of Baltimore, had charges preferred against him by members of his own church for sinful intimacies with a grass widow, also belonging to his congregation. The widow was induced to leave, and the matter was piously hushed up, and the pastor's preaching and praying were resumed.

Rev. Mr. Humpstone, Malta, N. Y., in consequence of a church difficulty, tendered his resignation in April, 1875.

On the following Sunday it was arranged that the Rev. Mr. Cook should officiate in his place: but, as he did not appear, it was suggested by a member that Brother Humpstone read the services. Dr. Bellinger opposed the proposition, and rebuked the brother for making it. When Brother Humpstone arose to speak, Dr. Bellinger ordered him to sit down. The ex-pastor would not be thus suppressed. The contending parties then clinched, and a disgraceful fight ensued.

Rev. J. K. Stillwell, of Logansport, Ind., was brought before the Church for making improper advances to the sisters of his flock. A clear case was made against him, and, without adding falsehood and perjury to his other crimes, he had the discretion to confess his offenses, resign his charge, and leave the place. The local papers regretted the circumstance, more especially as it came in the midst of a successful revival, which was sensibly checked by the publicity of the clerical scandal.

Rev. Thomas Barnard, of London, got disgracefully drunk, and in that condition went to the Globe Theatre, where Lydia Thompson was engaged. That evening a new piece was put upon the stage, in which Mrs. Thompson did not appear. This so enraged the drunken parson that he stamped, shouted, and hissed to such an extent that a policeman arrested him and took him to prison.

Rev. J. J. Reeder, a young clergyman, went, in 1874, to New Milford, Pa., and studied for a time under the Rev. E. F. Bledsoe, pastor of the Methodist church in that village. Subsequently he was sent to Newark (N. J.) Conference to fill a vacancy at that place. The young divine proved to be popular, especially with the younger sisters of the society, with whom he spent the most of his time. He afterwards manifested a great fondness for horse flesh. He traded in fast horses, and soon obtained the reputation of being a good judge of equine stock. He finally purchased a valuable horse, for which he gave his note: but just before it became due he suddenly decamped for parts unknown, leaving many unpaid bills behind. In his hasty flight he left his trunks

and books, which were sold to pay his debts: but, unfortunately, they went but a short way towards paying them. It is not known in what part of the moral vineyard he is now laboring.

Rev. Charles S. Macready, of Middleboro, Mass., on May 20, 1875, committed suicide by cutting his throat with a razor.

Rev. J. J. Howell, Presbyterian, Minneapolis, Minn., hung himself in May, 1875.

Rev. Samuel B. Wilson, of the First Presbyterian church, Louisville, Ky., was, in May, 1875. deposed by the Presbytery for immoral conduct.

Rev. John W. Porter, in the winter and spring of 1875 had a charge at Van Sycles Corners, Hunterdon Co., N. J. In addition to preaching he also taught school. It turned out that the villain basely seduced one of his young female pupils, named Silenda Stires. daughter of Peter W. Stires, a well-to-do-farmer in the neighborhood. While she was yet a mere child she was about to become a mother. Upon being questioned, she informed her parents of the nature of the lessons the clergyman had taught her. When confronted by the injured father, the villain confessed the crime, and turned over his horse and buggy to partly make amends for his shameful conduct, and, with his heart-broken wife. took the first train for another field of labor.

The case of Henry Ward Beecher and Mrs. Elizabeth R. Tilton is fresh in the minds of all. His protracted trial of six months for the crime of adultery, the amount of damaging testimony that was arrayed against him, his confession, etc., are not forgotten. Probably twenty-five millions of the people of America believe him guilty, not only of the offense charged against him, but also of barefaced perjury. when, for thirteen consecutive days, he swore positively that he had not done it. He still fills the pulpit as a spotless shepherd, to lead the little lambs to the arms of Jesus,

Lucius M. Pond, of Worcester, Mass., a zealous leader in the Methodist Church, and very active in all religious movements, committed forgeries to the amount of $100,000, and

borrowed and purloined all he could obtain, after which he suddenly left and had it given out that he had been murdered for his money. He intended to have gone to Australia, but was arrested in San Francisco and brought back, convicted, and punished.

Rev. Augustus C. Stange, Presbyterian, of Patterson, N. J., was guilty of gross improprieties with Sister Pfennibuker in the church. He was tried and acknowledged his guilt. The sister, however, accused the clergyman of forcing her contrary to her wishes.

Rev. John James Thompson, of Orange county, N. Y., was arraigned for making a criminal attack upon a young female member of his church. The plea made in his defense was insanity. There has been quite too much of that kind of insanity.

Rev. Ambleman Wright, of Whitestown, N. Y., by presents of money, coaxing, and so forth, induced a little girl of twelve years to yield her body to his lusts. He was a man with a wife and married daughters.

Rev. Frederick A. Bell, of Brooklyn, N. Y., was charged with making improper advances to Mrs. Mary Morris, a member of his church.

L. K. Strauss, superintendent of the Sunday-school in Huntington county, Pa., and deemed a very exemplary Christian, seduced one of the teachers, Miss West. The criminal practices were continued a long time until the young lady became stricken with remorse and confessed. He was tried and fined $4,500.

Rev. E. D. Winslow, of Boston, Mass., swindled confiding banks and financiers out of $500,000 and left suddenly for Europe.

Rev. J. J. Kane was sued by his wife for a divorce on account of inhuman treatment.

Elder Doolittle was tried in the Juneau county, Wis., Circuit Court on a charge of incest and adultery. The testimony was conclusive, he was found guilty and was sentenced to six years' imprisonment in the State prison at Waupun.

He was over sixty-three years of age; one of his victims was a simple-minded girl, his own niece.

Rev. F. W. May, presiding elder of the Methodist church, Chesaning, Mich., was guilty of grossly immoral practices with several of the sisters. A number of them testified against him.

Rev. Henry A. Heath, Methodist, formerly of Maine and later of Morrison, Ill., was a lecherous old hypocrite. He left his wife in Maine and committed adultery with numerous females, both pious and not pious. His crimes were many and black.

Rev. Joseph M. Berry was tried by his church in Asheville, N. C., for drunkenness and adultery, and was found guilty.

Rev. Jonathan Turner, Methodist, Fourth street, Philadelphia, was arraigned for embezzling from Mr. Myers, and was held in $1,000 bail.

Rev. F. F. Rea, of Durham, Conn., was expelled from the Congregational Church for drunkenness.

Rev. Seth B. Coats, of Dallas City, Ill., was tried for improper conduct with the females of his congregation, both single and married. The testimony was explicit and unfit for publication.

Rev. Mr. Parker, Presbyterian, Ashland, Ky., eloped with a young girl, daughter of a deacon of the church, and left a wife and several children.

Rev. Francis E. Buffum, Congregationalist, was tried at Hartford, Conn., for holding criminal intercourse with Miss Cora Lord, who lived in his family. He procured an abortion upon the young woman. His wife left him and sued for a divorce.

Rev. Mr. Kendrick seduced a little girl, the organist of his church, and but thirteen years of age. He accomplished his purpose with cheap jewelry and a twenty-five cent penknife.

Rev. E. S. Fitz, Southampton, Mass., was tried for very improper conduct with the sisters. The evidence was of the most spicy character and rather unfit for publication. The

brethren and sisters did all they could to screen him, but his guilt was too apparent.

Rev. G. M. Davis was caught by his wife in a very improper connection with another lady, and this in the church. Much excitement in consequence.

Rev. D. Ellington Burr, of Ellardsville, Mo., was tried and suspended for three years for using intoxicating liquors, and being criminally intimate with women.

Rev. J. B. Patterson, Presbyterian, Elizabeth, N. J., upon an examination being instituted, confessed to being guilty of drunkenness and immoral conduct with the sisters. He was very contrite.

Rev. James Regan Methodist, Madison, Ind., was deposed for improper intercourse with Mrs. McHenry, a beautiful widow. The crime was committed on board a steamboat on the Ohio River.

Rev. C. D. Lathrop was expelled by the First Congregational church of Amherst, Mass., for cruelty to his family, and other unchristian conduct.

Rev. Arthur Watson, Protestant, Killowen, near Kinman, over fifty years of age, killed his wife by shooting her.

Rev. E. P. Stemson, of Castleton, N. Y., was found intoxicated in the streets of this city and was arrested by officer Ryckman. The judge, in kindness, let him off.

Rev. Thomas B. Bott, of one of the Baptist churches in Philadelphia, has had many charges preferred against him for lascivious conduct with various females. The last one was Miss Louisa Younger, daughter of one of the deacons in his church. It was proved that he visited her at unseasonable hours, that they passed several days together at a place of summer resort, that they went in bathing together, and that he was seen in a nearly naked state in her private room. She was seen sitting in his lap, and they were kissing each other, etc. He had a wife and family, and his wife afterward brought suit against him for neglect and desertion.

Grafton Brown, one of the saints of the Carroll, M. E. church, seduced a daughter of Mr. Thomas Sellmon. He

had a wife and eight children, but insisted that his wife had become too cold for him. His case required one warm and ardent.

Rev. James Bradley, a brilliant preacher of the Ironside Baptist denomination at Huntsville, Mo., seduced one of the church sisters and lived in adultery with her for five years, when the arrival of a little infant brought his guilt to light, and he suddenly had business that called him elsewhere. The girl and her relatives were left to mourn her sad fate.

Rev. Mr. Wolfe, Presbyterian, Brooklyn, N. Y., was placed under bonds to keep the peace for knocking his wife down with an umbrella.

Rev. R. T. Green, of the English church at Ailsa Craig, Ont., was imprisoned for forging endorsements on a note.

Rev. John J. Thompson, Presbyterian, Washington city, was caught in his night-shirt crawling in the window of a sleeping-room where two young ladies slept. They made an outcry, when he threatened to shoot them if they were not still. He tried to get into bed with them. Members of his church strove to get him clear on the plea of insanity.

Rev. Levi S. Bettinger, in Baltimore county, Md., had placed in his charge a young lady to educate. He seduced her and then deserted her, but was allowed to retain his position.

Rev. A. J. Culver, of the Evangelical Association in eastern Iowa, a good-looking man and a strong-voiced preacher, whose field of labor was in the moral vineyard of Lisbon, Iowa, was so zealous in the cause of his master that he was called a lieutenant of Jesus. Being a single man, he engaged board with a widow who had a pretty and engaging daughter. It is not strange that Culver loved her, and he ought to have married her, for he was the father of a bouncing big boy of which she was the mother. Previous to the birth of the child she married a fine man in the neighborhood, a Mr. H——. When—soon after marriage—the child was born, her husband asked her who was the father. She answered it was the Rev. Culver. He was arraigned before a

council of clergymen; he was found guilty and expelled from his church. The conference, however, reinstated him in the holy calling of shepherd to the gentle lambs, and he is now delivering the bread of life to the sinners of Illinois. The girl swore to the paternity of the child before Peter Heller, justice of the peace. The husband, not wishing to raise any Culver stock, separated from his unfortunate wife and obtained a divorce from her. Thus her life was saddened and made wretched by the lusts of this pious man of God.

Rev. Mr. Speare, Mason, Ill., an intimate friend of a banker of that city, while the latter was busy with a customer, pocketed a roll of bank bills amounting to $1,000, took the train to Bloomington, deposited the money, and returned as if nothing had happened.

Rev. T. M. Dawson, Presbyterian, San Francisco, Cal., was guilty of the prevailing infirmity—too much "true inwardness." His love for the sisters was too ardent.

Rev. Lorenzo Dow, presiding elder, in eastern Kentucky, son of a clergyman, grandson of a clergyman, and namesake of a great clergyman, sent his wife to her father's without money, borrowed all the money he could from the brethren, and eloped with a girl, a daughter of another clergyman, at Louisa, Ky. He used a great amount of duplicity and falsehood to carry out his foul designs. It cast a great gloom over the entire community. A particular feature of the case was that the father of the girl could not say much, for years before, when a clergyman, he played the same trick with another man's daughter. Thus they go.

Dr. Harlan, Methodist, in a Nebraska town, was driven from the pulpit for lying, vulgarity, and defaming his brethren.

Rev. Alexander McKilvey, of Westfield, N. J., was deposed from the pulpit for criminal conduct.

Rev. R. Petteplace, of Lowell, Mass., was accused by his wife of committing adultery with the nurse-girl in their employ. An inquiry was instituted, when he confessed his guilt and "stepped down and out."

Rev. William H. Lee, Jersey City, was guilty of grossly beating his wife, and was tried for the offense.

Rev. F. D. James, of Somerville, Mass., was guilty of forgery by placing other people's names to deeds and other documents.

Rev. William Henry Jones, pastor of Grace Episcopal church, Toronto, was subjected to a trial upon fourteen different charges, among which were getting drunk, telling falsehoods, embezzling money, vulgar conversation, and other unsaintly offenses.

A clergyman of Oxford, England, was sentenced to twenty month's imprisonment for foully assaulting a girl of fourteen years of age whom he had but recently confirmed.

Rev. P. P. Wimberly, of Atchinson, Pa., started out on a grand begging campaign to raise money to pay the debts of his church; but he was overcome by the weakness of the flesh, and spent the money in sinful pleasures.

Rev. N. L. Phillips, Monticello, Iowa, of the United Brethren church, was guilty of immoral conduct with sister Barnes, wife of Herbert Barnes. After playing a base game with the unsuspecting husband in obtaining money from him, the guilty ones eloped together. The villainous clergyman left a legal wife and children behind, whom he piously recommended to continue family worship and prayer.

Rev. Prof. William F. Black, the leading clergyman in the Christian or Campbellite denomination in the West, and formerly president of the Northwestern Christian University at Indianapolis, fell from grace and was guilty of criminal conduct with Miss Corinne E. Voss, a gay and beautiful woman, daughter of a very wealthy lawyer and speculator. She started ostensibly to make a journey and visit some friends in Kansas, and by agreement he met her at Terre Haute and accompanied her to St. Louis, where they stopped over night at the Planter's Hotel, and passed themselves off as man and wife.

Rev. E. Hopkins, St. Johnsbury, Vt., was arrested on a charge of forgery, and was proved guilty.

Rev. Rudolph Weizerbeck, pastor of Bloomingdale German Lutheran Church, was arrested for defrauding the pension agency. When searched, two forged pension certificates were found upon his person.

Rev. Albert Rublete, Hoboken, N. J., was committed to prison for twenty days for fraudulent begging and intemperance.

Rev. Jerome D. Hopkins swindled the people of Brooklyn by falsely representing himself as poor, and as having a sister lying sick at Washington. In this way he raised considerable funds.

Rev. John H. Morris, who a portion of the time preached at the Passyunk Baptist church in Philadelphia, proved himself to be a criminal of the most revolting character. In 1875 he lost his wife, and subsequently married her sister. Soon after that he adopted a little girl eight years of age, named Mary Rue, daughter of a widow, and it turned out that for a year the brute—worse than any brute—had been holding criminal relations with that small child. His wife caught him in bed with the child at two o'clock in the night, and in the criminal act. The girl subsequently confessed all about it to her mother, and stated that the pious man by intimidation and threats had subjected her to his vile uses. He was imprisoned for trial.

Rev. J. H. Foster, whose last field of uselessness was in the First Congregational church at Hannibal, Mo., though talented, and prepossessing in appearance, and very popular with the sisters, turned out to be a bold, bad man—in fact, a regular wolf in sheep's clothing. It was proved that he had wives living to the number of five, and that he was a gambler and a dissolute person. He wore a most saintly countenance, but the devil was too near his heart. He discreetly resigned his charge, and betook himself to other and more congenial fields of labor.

Rev. John C. Simpson, of Oregon, Mo., was convicted of illicit distilling, the jury finding him guilty on all five counts. He was fifty years old, and had been preaching twenty years.

Elder Samuel H. McGhee, of the Christian or Campbellite denomination, whose last flock attended upon his ministrations at Ashton, Lee county, Ill., had the weakness to fall in love with a pretty, intelligent young lady of his church, named Lorilla Paddock, and that he might take her to his bosom, he procured poison and administered it to his wife, who died in great agony. His trial was held in Dixon, and the verdict of guilty was rendered against him. He was sentenced to fourteen years at hard labor in the State prison of Illinois.

Rev. J. P. Roberts, Methodist, of Ulien, Wis., was subjected to a trial for lying and slander.

Rev. J. F. Leak, Methodist, at Troy, Kansas, an aged clergyman, who for many years had been looked upon as a saint of the first water, brought himself into great tribulation by making love to an interesting young lady of his flock, who weekly attended upon his ministrations and drank in the words of piety that fell from his lips. He wrote her a number of letters, and pleaded with her most earnestly to fly with him to England where, by the side of a beautiful lake, like Como, they could make a paradise of their own, and where the rude eyes of curiosity could never find them out. For some reason they did not start for that lovely paradise; and an ugly feature of the interesting case is that the young lady has given birth to a child, and the dear pastor is in about as much trouble as he wishes to feel. The mishap is seriously regretted by all the faithful of the church, but such things seem to happen very frequently.

Rev. Mr. Keely, of Madison, was led into trouble by the bewitching airs of a pretty woman, named Clemmens.

Rev. John Moody, Cincinnati, was imprisoned for appropriating to his own use money that he had collected for building a church.

Rev. Dewitt Knowlton, Boltonville, was brought to great disgrace by the persistency with which a sister of the church demanded that he should acknowledge the paternity of her child. The affair cast a cloud over his otherwise fair name.

Rev. A. J. Warren, of the M. E. church, North Vernon, Ind., eloped with sister Stanton, carrying with them all the church and Sabbath-school funds of which he was possessed. He left a wife and four little children.

Rev. Mason Noble, of Sheffield, Mass., a popular Congregational clergyman, was formally charged with seduction by Miss Bella J. Clark, a former pupil of Westfield Normal School, where she had been employed as a seamstress in the clergyman's family.

Rev. W. S. Crow, Hinsdale, Ill., by his unlawful intercourse with a deacon's family, succeeded in breaking it up and getting himself deposed from the pulpit.

Rev. Martin Hoernlein, of Buffalo, was convicted of arson in the second degree for setting fire to his own house to obtain a large insurance he had placed upon the property.

Rev. R. W. Pearson, Baptist clergyman of Pittsburgh, had a sad time of it. Before a court of his own church he was proved guilty of lying, drunkenness, and numerous adulteries. He had resided in various parts of the country and had sinned in all of them. He was emphatically what is familiarly called a "fast man."

The case of John D. Lee, Mormon bishop, who was engaged in the Mountain Meadow massacre over twenty years ago, and who was shot by United States authorities for his heinous crime, is fresh in the public memory. Although his hands had long been red (metaphorically speaking) with the blood of his helpless fellow-beings, he died full of confidence and love of Jesus and felt sure of going straight to him as soon his breath left his body. He boasted at the hour of his death that he was not an Infidel, but died a good Christian.

Abbe Beaugard, vicar of an important post in Paris, was in 1877 sentenced to fifteen years' transportation for criminally assaulting two little girls and communicating to them a loathsome disease.

Rev. G. R. Williams, while preaching in Griggstown, N. Y., was engaged to marry a nice young lady of his congregation, when a former wife very inopportunely put in an

appearance and broke up the little arrangement. The clergyman soon found he had business that called him elsewhere.

Rev. Paul T. Valentine, Ph.D., and D.D., and LL.D., was tried and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment by Recorder Hackett in General Sessions in New York, April, 1877, for the most revolting and despicable crimes in the entire criminal calendar—the corruption and vile use of little boys and girls under his charge in what he called a "College for Homeless Children," where he pretended to teach them useful employment and to fit them for the actual duties of life, when in reality he practiced the grossest crimes known to man. Nine witnesses testified in the most pointed manner against him. Recorder Hackett said the case was the most atrocious that had ever come to his knowledge during his long service in the criminal courts of this wicked city, and he was only regretful that the extreme penalty for the crimes was not death. He gave the culprit the full extent prescribed by the law—ten years' imprisonment at hard labor.

Rev. Joseph Jones, a Baltimore Methodist clergyman, greatly gifted in revivals, got hold of a bequest of $50,000 which had been made to his church, and diverted it to his own benefit. He got involved, and when the crime was exposed he committed suicide.

Rev. E. J. Baird, a Richmond (Va.) Presbyterian clergyman, Secretary of the Presbyterian Publishing Committee, was tried for embezzling $22,000 of funds belonging to the Committee, and which he was unable to replace, and of course was summarily deposed.

Rev. Leaven Fausette, of Port Huron, La., was hung for murder.

Rev. Willis Treswell Bowman, of Harlem, N. Y., was, in the summer of 1877, charged by Miss Sarah Frances Washington with having taken very improper liberties with her one night after a church festival had been held.

Rev. Andrew C. Flesher was arrested near Bridgeport, Ill., upon a charge of bigamy. He married his first wife in

Virginia, whom he deserted; the second, a girl nineteen years of age, he married in Olney, Ill. He was arrested, held to bail, in default of which he was put in jail.

Rev. Joseph Whittemore, Baptist, of Mitchell, Iowa, was arrested, tried, and fined for making improper advances towards the wife of Deacon George Cummings of the same Church.

Rev. Darling R. Phillip, alias Rev. D. Rowland, as he was known in Richmond, Va., came to grief in Hackensack, N. J., in the autumn of 1877. The charges brought against him and sustained were fraud, false representation, assuming a false name, forging papers, preaching stolen sermons, and, worse than all, of making improper advances towards Mrs. A. B. Foote and other ladies.

The Rev. Alfred Thompson, of the Free Methodist Church, Elgin, Ill., was granted, in 1877, a leave of absence by his congregation to visit Europe. He left his wife and family behind. On his return trip, on board ship, he formed the acquaintance of a very pretty brunette, a Mrs. Cobham, the wife of another clergyman, and the pair became very intimate. Upon landing in New York they repaired to the West Side Hotel, registered as man and wife, and occupied the same room. Soon after he left to join his friends in the West, the lady discovered that her gold watch and chain, jewelry, and other trinkets had been stolen. Suspecting at once her clerical paramour to be the thief, she employed a detective and caused his arrest at the Pennsylvania Railroad depot, Jersey City, as he was about to take the cars for Chicago. He was committed to prison, and claimed that the articles were presented to him. This the lady denied. On the fifteenth of October, 1877, having had his trial in the court of General Sessions, New York, he was sentenced by Recorder Hackett to five years' imprisonment in the State prison at Sing Sing for stealing. The recorder interrogated the clerical villain in this wise: "Do you mean to say that your relations with the lady were improper?" "Well," replied the clergyman, with a leer, "we all do those things

more or less." "And are you a minister of the gospel?" "Yes." When the recorder pronounced the sentence, he said: "Stand up and be sentenced. A more filthy beast I have never met, and a more depraved clergyman I never saw. I am sorry I cannot give you a severer sentence than five years at hard labor at Sing Sing." The reverend gentleman smiled sardonically as he was led out between two police officers.

The Rev. Mr. Loring, Congregationalist, of Osage, Iowa, got into the pleasant habit of calling frequently upon Mrs. Hawley, wife of Deacon Hawley of the pastor's church. The frequency of the visits of the pastor aroused the suspicions of the deacon, and he decided to set a watch upon the clerical gentleman, and one day he surprised the couple by coming upon them suddenly, when he found the parson and Mrs. Hawley in the bedroom together. He assured them in the most positive manner that if they did not acknowledge the truth he would kill them on the spot. They then confessed to holding improper connection together. In excusing her criminality the deacon's wife stated that Parson Loring had assured her that there was no sin in the matter, so long as they were not found out; and that Christ had said that his lambs shall lie down together.

The wife of Rev. P. Brooks, of St. Louis, while fumbling among some Bibles, tracts, and hymn books which the elder had packed in a bag for an evangelical tour, found a bundle of letters addressed to him. She noticed that the language was very affectionate and the handwriting that of sister McDonald, and it may easily be imagined that the letters did not add to the peace of mind of sister Brooks. It so happened, that sister McDonald soon called to see the elder, whereupon sister Brooks upbraided her in the severest language and accused her of seeking to alienate the affections of her husband. Sister McDonald denied writing the letters, but sister Brooks, being sure she did, seized a rawhide and gave sister McDonald a severe whipping over the head and shoulders. The assailed sister was not disposed to take the

castigation meekly and she fought back vigorously with fists and finger nails, but the rawhide triumphed.

Rev. Simon Dixon, formerly of Brooklyn, but more recently of Baxtertown, N. Y., was held for trial upon a charge of seduction preferred by Sarah Jane Williams.

Rev. Mason Chenoweth, *alias* J. Mason Wells, was arrested in a church pulpit, at Bangor, Me., and taken to Springfield, Ill., on a charge of bigamy, or rather polygamy. The Springfield papers gave the full details of his sinful career, how he was first married in Ohio, where he lived with his wife seven years, when one day he left suddenly without giving her any notice of his intentions. He went to Iowa and acted as a class-leader in a Methodist church where he married one of the sisters and lived with her two years when he left her to journey alone, while he took another wife in Manchester, Scott Co., Ohio, and led a gay life. After seven months he again became very pious and joined the church anew. He joined the Baptists this time and was soon licensed to preach, when he deemed it pleasant to take for his fourth wife Miss Ruth Clement, aged nineteen years. He was now very godly, and assiduously devoted himself to the ministry, preaching in some eight different towns. In the fall of 1865 his Manchester wife died, and he married Miss Wrightman of Auburn, Ill. In 1874 he got into financial embarrassment and left Auburn. He changed his name from Wells to Chenoweth and preached at Aurora, Ind. Then he married again. He next returned to his original home in Ohio and found that his first wife had procured a divorce from him and had married another man who had died leaving her some property. The clerical gentleman then made love again to his first wife, pretending that he was unmarried and promising the utmost future faithfulness. They were re-married; when he tried to obtain possession of her property. She was shrewd enough to prevent this, when he treated her cruelly and left her again and returned to Aurora, forged the name of one of the deacons, and fled. The friends of his Aurora wife pursued him and brought him to justice.

Rev. Alfred Loutrel, a gray-haired clergyman, was before the Jefferson Market Court, New York. A young colored woman, who had served him as a servant, made the following statement, which the clergyman did not deny: "A short time after I went into Mr. Loutrel's employ, two years ago, he came into my room when I was asleep one night, awoke me, and carried me in my night-dress to his own bed, and placed me in it. I was afraid of him. He told me I was black but beautiful; that the Bible said so; that he thought a great deal of me, and would always do so; that he wanted me as a wife to him, and to always occupy a place by his side. I remained with him that night, and we have slept together as man and wife ever since. I liked him, and could not bear to be thrown off by him without a home or money. It made me tired of living: he was so good and kind to me, and turned upon me so suddenly without fault on my part." He was evidently an old sinner.

Rev. Sidney Corbett, D.D., of St. Mark's Episcopal church, Minneapolis, Minn., was brought into serious trouble upon charges of licentiousness, and a trial was held before a body of clergymen appointed by Bishop Whipple. Dr. Corbett was accused of making licentious advances to several women while in a partially intoxicated state, at his own residence. The charges were sustained by the evidence of the ladies. The doctor of divinity was, however, let down lightly.

Rev. D. R. Boothe, from England, came to grief in Terre Haute, Ind. He was tall, straight, well dressed, and genteel, and made a fine impression upon the female portion of the churches where he gave a few trial sermons. He was advertised to deliver a sermon in two different churches, one in the morning and the other in the evening, but an unfortunate occurrence prevented the programme being carried out. While he was standing in front of the hotel where he was stopping, one of the frail damsels of the city passed by and gave the fine-looking clergyman a wink, and to him a wink was as good as a nod, and he immediately followed her to her lair, when an inquisitive person who had observed the sus-

picious movement also followed them a little ways behind, and bursting into the room occupied by the couple, found them *flagrante delicto*. The scandal soon became noised about town, and the polished reverend packed his baggage and left on the next train. Thus, what Terre Haute lost some other town gained.

The Rev. W. G. Haskell was compelled to preach his farewell sermon in the Episcopal church at Medford, Mass., and to take his departure from his flock in that locality. A combination of unfortunate causes led to this result. One evening he took a large dose of Medford rum, and went to bed. He had scarcely fallen asleep when a surprise party of young people called and took possession of his house. He was compelled to arise and entertain his visitors; but alas! poor human nature! the rum had clearly taken effect, and the good dominie was pronounced drunk. Hence his disgrace.

The Rev. Mr. Dale of New Castle, Ill., revivalist, was run out of town by the indignant citizens of Arcadia, for assaulting, with criminal intent, two girls, aged respectively twelve and fourteen years. The matter was placed before the grand jury, and the reverend gentleman will undoubtedly give that locality a wide berth.

Rev. John P. Jones, Baptist, who had a charge at Butler, Pa., was arrested under the assumed name of John Anderson as he was about to embark on the Helvetia to sail for Europe and was taken to Pittsburgh. He is charged with having committed several forgeries, one upon a reverend gentleman at Apollo, another upon Mr. Osborne, an oil producer. He raised a note from $50 to $450; and raised a check from $27 to $727, besides numerous other forgeries of varying amounts and in different parts, several of the victims being members of his own church.

Rev. W. J. Clark, Presbyterian, of Lisbon, N. Y., was accused of immoral and unministerial conduct in visiting places of bad repute. The Synod passed upon his case and agreed that brother Clark's usefulness in the ministry had

been impaired by his conduct, and they suspended him from the ministry for the term of one year, with the hope that, by the expiration of that time, he could again resume the holy office and become a useful member of the clergy.

The case of Samuel A. McCoskry, D. D., Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Michigan, seventy-five years of age, is a sad one. He had arrived at a venerable age, and had for a long term of years been highly respected by his denomination, as well as by the public generally: but, in the spring of 1878, some very affectionate and rather amorous letters, which he had written to a fascinating young lady named Fannie Richards, were accidentally brought to light. This disclosure caused great commotion, and the aged bishop handed in his resignation and proceeded to New York, on his way to Europe. There he was taken sick, and remained some time at the house of a friend. It was believed that the letters could be declared forgeries, and that the bishop could resume his official functions; and, with this view, he withdrew his resignation and returned to Detroit; but while some of the letters could be explained that way, some came to light that could not be explained satisfactorily, whereupon the bishop sent in a third resignation, as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., May 18, 1878.

Having heretofore presented my resignation of jurisdiction of and over the diocese of Michigan, and subsequently withdrawn the same, I now desire, and do hereby resign my jurisdiction over the same, and do further resign and relinquish my office as Bishop in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and desire that the House of Bishops may meet at the earliest convenient season to consider and act upon this resignation, upon such length and manner of notice as shall be thought best by the presiding Bishop.

SAMUEL A. MCCOSKRY.

This resignation was accepted. Construed under the Church laws, it involved not only the resignation of the bishopric, but of the ministry also, and was of the most complete kind. The Convention voted to pay the resigned Bishop an annuity of $1,500, subject to revision by future conventions.

Thus an honored dignitary of one of the wealthiest and

most respected churches in America closes his career in deep disgrace.

There are large numbers of similar cases of clerical crimes and delinquencies, more or less known to the public, that might be added to this already lengthy and disgusting list, were it desirable—scarcely a person in the community but can remember cases of similar crimes and peccadilloes of clergymen, not here mentioned—but it is deemed that a sufficient number has been given to convince almost any person that the American clergy are very questionable saints, and that it is unsafe for them to be trusted too far with the wives and daughters of the Christian fold, and that there are good grounds for concluding that they are champions and practitioners of sensuality rather than models and guides of heavenly purity.

U. S. Senator Brownlow, of Tennessee, who was for many years a clergyman, as well as an editor, and afterwards governor of the State, in his book, published some years ago, used this language in reference to clergymen in the South: "I have no hesitancy in saying, as I now do, that the worst men who make tracks upon Southern soil are Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Episcopal clergymen, and at the head of them for mischief are the Methodists" (p. 187). "A majority of the clergymen have acted upon the principle that the kingdom of their divine master is of this world, and, as a consequence, many of them have embarked in fighting, lying, and drinking mean whiskey" (p. 290). "Here, as in all parts of the South, the worst class of men are preachers. They have done more to bring about the deplorable state of things existing in the country [referring to the war of the Rebellion] than any other class of men. And foremost in this work of mischief are the Methodist preachers. Brave in anticipation of war, and prone to denunciation on all occasions, even in the pulpit, they have been among the first to take to their heels" (p. 392).

To give some idea of the Catholic clergy, a few quotations will be given from one who had excellent opportuni-

ties for knowing their habits and customs, Father John W. Gerdermann, ex-Catholic priest of St. Bonifacius' church in Philadelphia. After renouncing the hypocritical priest-life which he had led for ten years, in a lecture delivered to an immense audience in that city, in the summer of 1875, he gave this faithful picture of the false-hearted fraternity he had forsaken:

"I come now to the last great blot on the character of the Roman clergy, which you will allow me to treat in a cursory manner out of respect to the audience I have the honor to address. Priests are not allowed to marry: would to God they were. They are called Fathers by the people, and, unfortunately, with many it is not only a name but a sad reality; not the honored, hallowed name of father, but a name whispering of shame and a broken heart, if not a ruined family. Undoubtedly, the young men who are ordained priests are generally pure, sincere, and good: but alas! the system of celibacy, at all times the bane of the Catholic ministry, too often ruins them. I spoke to a priest last year about this time, about getting married and leaving the Church. He called me a fool, and advised me not to leave the easy life of the priesthood, but to do like him and keep a mistress. I thanked him for his advice, and told him I was no dog. Bishop Wood told me of more than one priest in his diocese whom he characterized as immoral, and thoroughly bad men who, to this day, hold their offices. Marry, forsooth, in an honorable way, the priest is not allowed, but ruin a poor girl he may. It is better, the pope teaches, for a priest to have two concubines than marry one woman lawfully. Shame upon such morality! Shame upon the Church with such teaching!

"I repeatedly have heard good and sincere priests say it was a blessing the American people did not know the true character of the Roman priesthood, for if they did, they would sweep them out of the country, and I assure you, if you should know them as I do, you would not consider the remark any too harsh. Firstly, they have an inordinate

desire for money. The poor people are asked for money at all times and occasions. The more a man gives, the better he is liked. He must pay every time he comes to church, and every time the priest comes to him. No matter how poor the family may be, how hard the man may work, how much the mother may slave, how poorly the children are clad, no matter whether the grocer is paid, the priest must have his dues. Baptisms, marriages, and funerals, must be paid for, and woe to the poor Catholic who offers a priest less than five dollars. Too much he can never give. Go to any Catholic church in this city on Sunday, and you hear something about money, always. The more a priest returns to the bishop, for the seminary or other purposes, the higher he rises in the bishop's esteem. Provided a priest is sound on the money question his other qualities are of minor importance. I know over five hundred priests and sixty bishops in this country; I have frequently been in priests' and bishops' company, and whenever the question came on the congregations they never asked. 'How are your people? are they temperate? faithful in attendance at church? do they raise their children well?' but always, 'How much pew-rents do you get?' 'What do your collections amount to?' 'What do you get at Christmas?' 'What are your fees for baptism and marriage?' and if the sums did not seem large enough, you would hear a 'Damn it, that's little.' I know priests who have been scarce ten years in the priesthood and who own from $20,000 to $40,000. And the poor people who give are never told where the money goes to. No priest knows what the bishop owns. No congregation hears what a priest receives nor how it is spent. And how is it spent? A good deal of it in gambling, cigars, grand dinners, and good drinks. Priests are, without doubt, the best livers in the country. Whenever you meet a company of priests, be it on Sunday or week-day, night or day-time, you nearly always find them at a game of euchre, and not for mere pastime, but for money. I often saw, especially Irish priests, play for quarters, halves, and a dollar a game. The German priests were generally

content with a game for ten cents. Then come the grand dinners, served in the most approved style, for which the good people foot the bill. Those dinners are not gotten up on a small scale, either, but cost from $500 to $2,500. The bishop gives generally three or four grand dinners a year, when the priests are invited, and God knows how many on a smaller scale. Priests give their dinners on stated occasions—at the funeral of a priest, and the day of a corner-stone laying, or at the dedication of a new church, and annually on the last day of the forty hours. The poor are in at their prayers, while the good fathers are enjoying their terrapin, canvas-back, and champagne.

"But the great curse of the priesthood in this country is the vice of drunkenness. Of the extent of this vice I can give you no adequate idea. When priests meet, the first and the last thing is a drink; early in the morning and late at night, the whiskey-bottle is their consolation. If you would not offer whiskey and wine, and plenty of it, to your visitors, you would soon be spotted and cried down as a fool. Bishop Wood, who was a frequent visitor at my house, said he did not want any 'Teutonic acid,' meaning good German wine, but insisted on having champagne. And let me show you that his capacity is rather a large one. I was traveling with him in Schuylkill county, three or four weeks before I left the Church, and I will now give you his day's work. Early that morning he confirmed in the German church at St. Clair. After having administered confirmation, a good breakfast was spread before him. He did not touch it but asked for a bottle of wine. Good Father Froude was rather surprised, and said: 'Hallo! wine for breakfast!' After the wine was finished we went to the English church. There the bishop complained of the poor wine of Father Froude, and asked for and received a bottle of champagne. After he had given confirmation there, a few glasses of lager beer were enjoyed. Then came dinner, and a good one it was, and he partook freely of beer, wine, champagne, and brandy to wash it down. Before we left St. Clair for Mahony Plain, on the Superintendent's

special car, a few more bottles of champagne were opened and dispatched by him and the priests present. Scarcely had we reached Father O'Connor's house when he asked for goat-milk punch, of which he took two or three glasses, afterward he followed it with a few glasses of champagne. Still he got through with confirming about two hundred people, only complaining of not being quite well; the dinner of terrapin, pheasants, and other choice things served afterwards, he did not enjoy, and he went to bed, where I brought him the last glass of champagne after eleven o'clock. When you hear that a bishop can do so much in that line, and still be able to give confirmation, you will not be surprised to hear that bills for liquors and wines are large with a priest who often enjoys his visits. To be serious, the greater part of the priests who have died in this diocese since I was ordained died of too much drink, and many priests are serving there now who more than once suffered from delirium tremens.

"To see priests drunk in their houses is bad enough, but how much worse, how much more disgraceful is it for them to be drunk in the pulpit and at the altar! Even in September last, I heard a sermon preached at the close of the forty hours' devotion, one of the most solemn occasions in the Catholic Church, by a priest when under the influence of liquor. That man arrived about two o'clock in the afternoon, completely drunk. He slept off, it is true, partly the effects of his debauch, still, when he preached at seven o'clock he was anything but sober. After the ceremonies were over, he recommenced his potations, mixing whiskey, beer, wine, and champagne, till he fell on the floor beastly drunk.

"That man is in the mission to-day, pastor of a large congregation, although it is well known that not a week passes in which he is not drunk once or twice. On another occasion a priest—who now rests in a drunkard's grave—was so completely drunk when carrying the wafer in procession through his church, that I and another priest, who acted as deacons, had to support him to keep him from falling. I might adduce many more instances of the fearful intemperance prevailing

among the Roman clergy; but I suppose enough has been said to convince you that temperance is a virtue almost unknown among them."

This chapter will be closed with a few paragraphs upon the American clergy from the ex-reverend E. E. Guild, who was for many years a Protestant clergyman; but who, from honest investigation and conviction, was induced to abandon the profession he no longer believed it was right for him to follow. He is now an old man, highly respected by those who know him, and his testimony may be received with all confidence. The quotations are made from his "Pro and Con of Supernatural Religion:"

"Undoubtedly the priesthood, like all the other learned professions, is composed of both good and bad men. But, on the score of merit, it cannot justly claim any superiority over the others. Doubtless the clergy are no better, nor any worse, than the average of men, only so far as the false position which they occupy makes them so. With them the business of theological and religious teaching is a profession and a means of obtaining a livelihood. Before they enter upon their work they must, before God and man, make solemn professions of faith in a certain creed to which they are expected to adhere and defend during life. On their doing this their living depends. They have a pecuniary interest at stake. The creed must be maintained, missionary work must be done, contributions must be raised, revival excitements must be gotten up, converts must be made, for all this brings grist to their mill. They are conservative in their tendencies, opposed to all innovation, tenacious and bigoted in their opinions, and blind to all newly-discovered truth. They can seldom see the word truth, because, with them, it is covered by a dollar. Their occupation leads them into the practice of conscious or unconscious hypocrisy. They assume a character before the people that they by no means maintain in their families, or when in company with each other. However grave, sanctimonious, and circumspect they may appear in public, when assembled in company by

themselves they are the most jolly of men. They can then crack their jokes, tell funny stories, relate smutty anecdotes, and indulge in low gossip to an extent unequaled by any except professional libertines. They denounce human selfishness, and are of all men the most selfish; declaim against avarice, and are mercenary and avaricious: preach against pride, fashion, and love of the world, and yet are as proud, as servile imitators of fashion, and manifest as much of the love of the world as other men. They insist on the necessity of self-denial, but think themselves entitled to the most comfortable places, the best bits, the choicest dainties, the lion's share of all the good things of life. They profess to be awfully concerned and anxious for the welfare of poor sinners, but their sleek, smooth, well-to-do appearance gives no indication of excessive anxiety. They claim that men in their natural state are totally depraved, and yet, in this country at least, they profess to believe in a free government, founded on the principle that the people have a right to govern themselves, an inconsistency so glaring that it makes us suspicious of their sincerity.

"The art of proselyting they understand to perfection. This is an important part of their business. However ignorant they may be on all other subjects, this they perfectly well understand. They are in possession of all the accumulated experience of a long line of predecessors extending through all of the past ages. They know human nature well, and how to take advantage of its weaknesses. They make their appeals to the superstitious, selfish hopes and fears of ignorant men, and having what Archimedes only wanted, another world on which to plant their machinery, it is no wonder that in almost all past time they have moved this at their pleasure. They tax all their ingenuity and eloquence in describing the beauties of a heaven about which they know nothing, and a hell of which they are equally ignorant, and the one they promise as a reward to all who embrace their doctrines, the other they threaten as a punishment to be inflicted on all who do not. In this way they may

succeed, perhaps, in luring some and entrancing others, but no man was ever made really any better by being actuated by such selfish considerations. They condemn human selfishness and yet cultivate and strengthen it by making constant appeals to it. They are the greatest beggars in the world. Their horse-leech cry of give, give, can be heard on the mountains and in the valleys, in the public streets and in the churches. At every public meeting ostensibly for the worship of God, the contribution-box is passed around, and the people are entreated in God's name to give. The people are assured that if they will give, God will restore to them four fold, but not one of them will stand sponsor for the fulfillment of the promise or guarantee the refunding of the gift in case it is not. In a thousand varieties of ways vast sums of money are raised by these men, which goes to help the warring sects to vie with each other in building costly churches and to support a class of useless drones in the human hive.

"The same envyings and jealousies that exist among the members of other learned professions exist among them. They will unscrupulously resort to measures to supplant a brother in an advantageous situation, or in the esteem and affections of the people, which lawyers and physicians scorn to adopt, and have too great a sense of honor and manhood to think of adopting. If one of their number happens to become convinced of the erroneousness of his creed, and has independence and moral courage enough to avow his honest opinions, the rest will pounce on him like a hawk upon a chicken. They will pursue him with misrepresentations and slander, hurl at him the epithets of 'Infidel,' 'emissary of Satan,' 'enemy of religion,' call him a Judas, a renegade, an apostate, ostracise him from society if they can, and all to counteract his influence in opposition to their sectarian views. On the other hand, if one of their profession is accused of any crime, the rest of the fraternity will gather around him, form a solid phalanx, and shield him from exposure if they can. The peculiar position occupied by these men brings them into close relation to the female sex. They, knowing

that women are more susceptible of religious as well as superstitious influence than men, regard them as their right-hand weapon of offensive and defensive war. They rely mainly on them to further their designs. Women, educated to believe that they must depend on men for support and protection, will inevitably be inclined to look up to the clergy for religious guidance and instruction. This brings them into frequent and familiar intimacy with that class of men. What has been the result? Not only are our sectarian churches made up principally of women and children, but the history of the priesthood in all ages and countries proves that by no other class of professional men have so many crimes against female virtue been committed as by them.

"The clergy profess to look upon what they call Infidelity and Materialism with the utmost horror and detestation. They represent that the Materialistic doctrines are destructive of all joy and peace on earth, and deprive us of all our bright hopes and anticipations in regard to the future. Apparently they are entirely unconscious of the fact that they themselves are constantly promulgating a doctrine as much more horrible than anything in Materialism as it is in the power of the human imagination to conceive. At the very worst, even, ultra-Materialism would do nothing worse than consign us to the quiet sleep of non-existence or annihilation, whereas the doctrine of the clergy would involve a majority of our race in miseries untold, never-ending, and indescribable. All, therefore, who hope for a future blissful existence must desire it with the full knowledge that if they have it, they enjoy it at the expense of the endless and inconceivable sufferings of millions of their fellow-men. Can a more monstrous exhibition of supreme selfishness be conceived?

"These men claim, too, that by some mysterious supernatural process they have experienced such a change of nature, such a regeneration of character, such a sanctification of mind and heart, as fits them to be the mouth-pieces of God and the leaders and instructors of mankind. But of what use is it

for them to pretend to any superior sanctity, when all intelligent men know, and all the world ought to know, that they 'are men of like passions as others,' that they have the same appetites, passions, desires, faults, and foibles that all men have. The criminal records of the country prove that in proportion to their numbers no class of educated men furnish a greater number of the inmates of our jails and prisons than the clergy."

There are in the United State over seventy thousand clergymen. "We would utilize this element of society. That portion of them who, by their education, talents, and moral worth, are qualified for the work, we would have converted into teachers in our schools and seminaries of learning, public lecturers, and leaders of the people in the great work of reform. We would have them teach their fellow-men on those subjects about which they have some positive knowledge, and in relation to which it is of the utmost importance that they be informed. We would have them teach the people to know themselves, to do their own thinking, to form their own opinions, to understand the laws of their own nature, and the conditions on which the prosperity and happiness of human beings depend. We would place them on a level with the rest of mankind, give them the same chances, the same opportunities, and let them depend on themselves, instead of being merely dependents upon others. As for the rest, we would have them expend the force and energy, which they now spend for nought, in some branches of trade or agriculture, and thereby make themselves a blessing to the world.

"To this, or something like this, it must come at last. The people will not always suffer themselves to be led hoodwinked to their own destruction. A revolt is sure to come, and when it does come it is to be hoped that the crimes of the priesthood against humanity will not be too vividly remembered against them, and that the sins of their predecessors who lived in the dead past will not be visited on those who exist in the living present."

ANTHONY COMSTOCK.

THIS compilation of Christian Champions—those who in the name of morality and the Christian religion have persecuted and annoyed others—would be incomplete without a reasonable notice of the character who heads this sketch. It would be doing himself and the public serious injustice not to place him side by side with those unworthy compeers of his who have abused the arbitrary power which for a time was placed in their hands. In every instance these persecutors who in the past have been so ready to ruthlessly deprive of liberty, happiness, and life their unfortunate victims, who did not subscribe to the doctrines enjoined by the ruling powers, have done so in the name of the religion of Jesus and under the auspices of the highest system of morality said to be known to man.

Comstock has evinced the same energy, the same cruelty the same intolerance, the same hardness of heart, and the same unyielding persistence in harassing and hunting down those who presumed to differ from the orthodox standard of religious thought—and have dared to be independent in matters of theology, medicine, and the literature pertaining to them—that have marked the envenomed persecutors of the past centuries. It is the time and the advance that has been made in civilization that have made the difference. This man has evinced the disposition of hatred and cruelty that a few centuries ago would have made a first-class Torquemada, Calvin, Alva, Charles IX., or Matthew Hopkins. Could he have the power he craves and the requisite opportunity, it is not to be supposed he would be far behind those notorious characters in the work of desolation, cruelty, and bitter persecution which they showed

themselves so capable of performing. He evidently engages in his work of persecution with the same degree of zeal and pleasure that marked the conduct of the Christian torturers and assassins alluded to. It is seriously doubted whether the Church has ever had a cruel zealot in its employ who has labored with more resolution and zest than this active agent of the Young Men's Christian Association.

It is not to be denied that those bloody persecutors, commissioned by the Church to torture and slay the hapless victims who fell in their way, each possessed some good qualities and that among the heartless acts they performed, some were commendable. So it is with Anthony Comstock; he has done some good; and far is it from the writer of these pages to deny him any of the good he has performed, though the means by which he reaches his ends, and by which he brings the unfortunate to punishment, are not such as good men can approve. Among a certain class of vile publishers he has accomplished a reform that must be placed to his credit, but the system of falsehood, subterfuge, and decoy-letters that he has employed to entrap his victims and inveigle them into the commission of an offense against the laws is utterly to be condemned.

The want of discrimination which he has evinced between those who were really guilty of issuing vile publications—whose only object was to inflame the baser passions—and those who published and sold books for the purpose of educating and improving mankind, has been a serious defect with this man. While he has suppressed much that is vile, he has, to a much larger extent, infringed upon the dearest rights of the individual, thus bringing obloquy and disgrace upon those who had a good object in view. And upon those who, in a limited degree, were in fault, he has been severe and relentless to a criminal extent. He has evinced far too much pleasure in bringing his fellow-beings into the deepest sorrow and grief; and under the name of arresting publishers of, and dealers in, obscene literature, he has caused the arraignment of numerous persons who had not the slightest inten-

tion of violating the rules of propriety and morality. Could he have expended his zeal and energy only upon those who deserved punishment, and have brought them under the rule of the law by fair and honorable means, his record would stand far better than it does to-day.

In that case he would not have been compelled to make the humiliating confession which he made in a public meeting of clergymen and others in Boston, May 30, 1878, where he was endeavoring to organize a branch, auxiliary "Society for the Suppression of Vice," the parent society of which is of Comstock's origination, and located in New York. While Comstock was addressing the meeting, the Rev. Jesse H. Jones (Congregationalist) arose, and expressed a wish to ask Mr. Comstock a few questions. He was permitted to ask three, when a disposition was manifested that the interrogatories be not continued. The questions propounded were as follow: 1. "Did you, Mr. Comstock, ever use decoy letters and false signatures? 2. Did you ever sign a woman's name to such decoy letters? 3. Did you ever try to make persons sell you forbidden wares, and then, when you had succeeded, use the evidence thus obtained to convict them?" To each of these questions Comstock answered, "Yes, I have done it," whereupon Mr. Jones, with firmness of manner, asserted that "Mr. Comstock had been guilty of what would be considered disgraceful in a Boston policeman." It is unfortunate for the reputation of Mr. Comstock, and the society which sustains him, and in whose name he works, that the most of his business, and the larger share of his victims and arrests have been brought about by these agencies. He has simply acted the part of a despicable spy and detective. Falsehood, deception, traps, and pitfalls for the unwary have been the agencies he has employed in the prosecution of his nefarious business. It is confidently asserted that he has written thousands upon thousands of decoy letters, bearing fictitious signatures of both men and women, and written for the purpose of inducing unsuspecting persons to commit an offense against the laws, and to be guilty of a crime which they would not otherwise

have thought of committing. It must be admitted by all honorable men that this is a contemptible course to be pursued by a society of moral, high-minded men, which was organized in the name of morality and the Christian religion. It is a question for moralists to decide whether, when a cause or a system has to be sustained by such a dishonorable course of conduct, it would not be better that the society disband and its agent resort to a more honorable means of obtaining a livelihood.

Anthony Comstock is a native of New Canaan, Conn., where he was born March 9, 1844, and where he resided through childhood and youth. It is unnecessary to inquire into the details of his early life. There have been worse boys as well as many far better than he was. When quite a young man, and during the war of the Rebellion, he obtained a position as sutler's clerk in one of the Connecticut regiments, which he held for a while, but for sufficient reasons was discharged. Subsequently, about the years 1871 and 1872, he was in the employ of the dry-goods house of Cochran & McLean, 464 Broadway, New York, where he served in the capacity of traveling salesman; but in due time the firm saw fit to dispense with his services.

It was while connected with this dry goods house that Comstock seems to have conceived the brilliant idea of waging a warfare upon the publishers and venders of obscene literature, as well as all who dared to deviate from the rule prescribed by his saintly societies. Being a member of the Young Men's Christian Association, he not only acted under their auspices to a certain extent, but he originated a new organization, called "The New York Society for the Suppression of Vice," or rather, perfected an organization that had previously been begun. It was modeled and named after a similar society in London, which made it its business to hunt down and prosecute those who do not think and act according to the orthodox standard, and which in 1877 prosecuted Mr. Charles Bradlaugh and Mrs. Annie Besant for publishing Dr. Charles Knowlton's "Fruits of Philosophy," a work of

merit which has been sold for forty years in that country and in this; and in the spring of 1878 prosecuted and convicted Edward Truelove, an old Freethought publisher eighty-six years of age, and secured a sentence of four months' imprisonment and a fine of fifty pounds sterling. His offense was selling Robert Dale Owen's "Moral Physiology," a work of decided value which has been sold in England and in the United States for more than a generation.

The London Society for the Suppression of Vice was founded three-fourths of a century earlier than its namesake of New York, and was conducted by the same system of espionage, decoying, and informing that has characterized its more modern namesake; and so learned and good a man as Sydney Smith entertained a very indifferent opinion as to the character of the men composing it. He says: "It is hardly possible that a society for the suppression of vice can ever be kept within the bounds of good sense and moderation. If there are many members who have really become so from a feeling of duty, there will necessarily be some who enter the society to hide a bad character, and others whose object it is to recommend themselves to their betters by a sedulous and bustling inquisition into the immoralities of the public. The loudest and noisiest suppressors will always carry it against the more prudent part of the community; the most violent will be considered as the most moral; and those who see the absurdity will, from the fear of being thought to encourage vice, be reluctant to oppose it. . . . Beginning with the best intentions in the world, such societies must, in all probability, degenerate into a receptacle for every species of tittle-tattle, impertinence, and malice. Men whose trade is rat-catching, love to catch rats; the bug-destroyer seizes on his bug with delight: and the suppressor is gratified by finding his vice. The last soon becomes a mere tradesman like the others; none of them moralize, or lament that their respective evils should exist in the world. The public feeling is swallowed up in the pursuit of a daily occupation, and in the display of a technical skill."

As to Sydney Smith's views of the means and the kind of agents which the society employed to secure its victims and to make its arrests, he expressed himself as follows: "An informer, whether paid by the week, like the agents of this society, or by the crime, as in common cases, is in general a man of a very indifferent character. So much fraud and deception are necessary for carrying on his trade—it is so odious to his fellow-subjects—that *no man of respectability will ever undertake it.* It is evidently impossible to make such a character otherwise than odious. A man who receives weekly pay for prying into the transgressions of mankind, and bringing them to consequent punishment, will always be hated by mankind, and the office must fall to the lot of some man of desperate fortunes and ambiguous character. If it be lawful for respectable men to combine for the purpose of turning informers, it is lawful for the lowest and most despicable race of informers to do the same thing; and then it is quite clear that every species of wickedness and extortion would be the consequence."

Every candid person must acknowledge the correctness and force of these remarks. An honorable, good man will never willingly accept the office of a spy and informer to lie in wait and watch for the errors and weaknesses of his fellow-beings and then, by decoying them on and entrapping them, use their simplicity or their confidence to throw them into prison and effect their utter ruin.

The New York Society for the Suppression of Vice was incorporated by the Legislature of New York, May 16, 1873, chiefly through the efforts of Anthony Comstock, its secretary and active agent, and the Young Men's Christian Association. He also procured the enactment by the United States Congress, and by the Legislature of New York State of a series of acts, which were placed in both the national and State statute books, and which are believed by many to be subversive of the very principles of American liberty and destructive to individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution of our country. Of the some half dozen of these Comstock acts, which by his

urgent efforts have become parts of the laws of our land, two sections will here be given as specimens of all:

SEC. 3893. No obscene, lewd, or lascivious book, pamphlet, picture, paper, print, or other publication of an indecent character, or any article or thing designed or intended for the prevention of conception or procuring of abortion, nor any article or thing intended or adapted for any indecent or immoral use or nature, nor any written or printed card, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where or how, or of whom, or by what means either of the things before mentioned may be obtained or made, nor any letter upon the envelope of which, or postal card upon which indecent or scurrilous epithets may be written or printed, shall be carried in the mail; and any person who shall knowingly deposit, or cause to be deposited, for mailing or delivery, any of the herein before-mentioned articles or things, or any notice or paper containing any advertisement relating to the aforesaid articles or things; and any person who, in pursuance of any plan or scheme for disposing of any of the herein before-mentioned articles or things, shall take or cause to be taken, from the mail any such letter or package, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, for every offense, be fined not less than one hundred dollars, nor more than five thousand dollars, or imprisoned at hard labor not less than one year, nor more than ten years, or both.

SEC. 5389. Every person who, within the District of Columbia, or any of the Territories of the United States, or other place within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, sells, or lends, or gives away, or in any manner exhibits or offers to sell, or to lend, or to give away, or in any manner to exhibit, or otherwise publishes or offers to publish in any manner, or has in his possession, for any such purpose, any obscene book, pamphlet, paper, writing, advertisement, circular, print, picture, drawing, or other representation, figure, or image on or of paper or other material, or any cast, instrument, or other article of an immoral nature, or any drug or medicine, or any article whatever, for the prevention of conception, or for causing unlawful abortion, or who advertises the same for sale, or writes or prints, or causes to be written or printed, any card, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind, stating when, where, how, or of whom, or by what means, any of the articles in this section hereinbefore mentioned can be procured or obtained; or manufactures, draws, or prints, or in anywise makes any of such articles, shall be imprisoned at hard labor in the penitentiary for not less than six months, nor more than five years for each offense, or fined not less than one hundred dollars, nor more than two thousand dollars, with costs of court.

While there are commendable features in these laws it must be confessed that the foregoing sections are excessively severe, besides being indefinite. When such heavy penalties are imposed, the offenses for which they are prescribed should be clearly marked out. If obscenity, indecency, and immor-

ality are crimes to be punished by fines of $5,000 and imprisonment at hard labor for ten years, they should at least be clearly defined, so that every person can know what the law considers immoral, what indecent, and what obscene.

A learned jurist has said that "no legislative body in making laws should use language that has to be defined and construed by others. Every crime should be so clearly defined that there can be no mistaking it. Murder, homicide, arson, larceny, burglary, forgery, and so forth, are so defined that they cannot be misunderstood. It is not so with obscenity; the term is left to be construed by judges, lawyers, juries, and whoever chooses to decide what *is* obscene and what is *not*. If obscenity is a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment, it at least ought to be correctly described so that it may be known in what it consists, and so that an accused person shall not be at the mercy of a man or a number of men who construe what is obscene, what is indecent and immoral, by their own particular opinion or notion of morality and immorality. What is obscene to one man may be as pure as the mountain snow to another, and one man should not be empowered to decide for other men."

To procure the enactment of the foregoing laws, Comstock made frequent journeys to Washington, and he carried with him, it is said, a satchel full of lewd, filthy books, pictures, and devices which he spread out before congressmen and which he induced them to believe were being sent through the mail by scores of tons to the youth of the country and to the young school children at seminaries, boarding-schools, and so forth. After the law-makers had been regaled with a view of these unclean curiosities, they seemed to be prepared to vote, Aye, on almost any kind of laws for which their vote might be solicited. It is to be regretted that they could not have displayed better judgment than to destroy the very principles of American Liberty and Individual Freedom for the sake of protecting school children from the imaginary belief that improper mail matter was sent them. If it is true that such mail matter is sent them, how easy

it would be to obviate it by having it inspected by teachers or guardians before passing it over to the children. This could be readily done without violating the Constitution of our country or crushing the rights of the entire people.

The time and mode by which these laws were enacted were extremely discreditable to American legislation. The final passage took place in the closing hours of the Forty-second Congress, on the third of March, 1873, when within a few hours, and when the house was in the wildest state of confusion, and numbers of the members were under the influence of ardent spirits, some two hundred and sixty acts were hurried through without inquiry or consideration. In many instances even the titles of the bills voted upon were unknown to members.

The signing by President Grant was performed in the same hurried, reckless manner. Hundreds of laws were thus signed by him without the slightest examination on his part and as rapidly as, one after another, they could be handed him by an attendant. And thus were placed upon our statute books a set of laws that should never have appeared there in the way they do. The personal wrongs that have been inflicted under them have not been few nor trivial.

A very similar set of laws were, by the personal exertions of Mr. Comstock, and by a similar style of tactics, passed by the Legislature at Albany and became a part of the laws of the State of New York, and combined with the United States laws just referred to, they have proved an engine of oppression to many individuals who under them have been suddenly brought to the deepest grief.

It will probably not be out of place to briefly narrate some of the cases which Mr. Comstock has mercilessly prosecuted under the laws which he procured to be enacted, as well as to show the true character of the man when he is able to bring unfortunate persons under the weight of his power. Attention is called to the means employed by him in securing his victims and the amount of mercy evinced towards them when brought under his ban.

1. Case of Charles Mackey, of New York, who was engaged in publishing a popular weekly story paper and in selling a miscellaneous variety of books, and who was arrested by Comstock in 1872 or '73. Mackey issued a catalogue of his books which he sent out to various parts of the country. Comstock sent to him for certain books, by mail, upon which, with the circular, he caused Mackey's arrest. There were no obscene books among Mackey's stock, though some of the titles on the catalogue were somewhat suggestive, as "Ovid's Art of Love," "Prostitution in Paris," etc. The case was tried before Judge Benedict of the U. S. Circuit Court. Comstock was the only witness. He testified that he had not received any obscene book from Mackey, and that he did not know of anything obscene that Mackey had in his possession save his catalogue. Mackey's lawyer asked the privilege to show to the jury that none of the books named in the catalogue were of an obscene character. This the judge would not permit, holding that the titles were obscene whether the books were or not. He charged the jury accordingly, whereupon a verdict of guilty was brought in, and Mackey was sentenced to one year's imprisonment besides a fine of $500. It was a heavy blow to Mr. Mackey. Previous to the arrest he stood high in the community and was doing a flourishing business. He was worth some $40.000, but the conviction, trial, and sentence nearly ruined him. His paper expired, his book trade went down, his reputation was blasted, his friends forsook him, and all because Anthony Comstock, Judge Benedict, and the jury did not approve of the title of the books upon his catalogue. It was a decided case of legal persecution and oppression.

On the day Mackey was taken from the prison to be sentenced, Comstock showed the natural meanness of his character by requesting that handcuffs be placed on Mackey, when he was remanded to prison, the same as upon the thieves and other felons. The suggestion was acted upon, and Mackey, who had stood so fairly in the city, was handcuffed to a convicted thief and thus marched through the streets. Com-

stock placed himself close by where the prisoners passed, and chuckled and grinned at Mackey as though he enjoyed absolute pleasure in a fellow-being's ignominy and disgrace.

2. Case of James Sullivan.—This gentleman was a dealer in books and light literature at 113 Fulton street. Comstock, as protector of the morals of the public, visited Sullivan's establishment, and, pulling out three dollars from his pocket and laying them on the counter, said, "I want a copy of 'The Lustful Turk.'" Sullivan replied, "I do not keep that kind of books. You see what stock I have. I will be glad to sell you three dollars' worth of such as I have, but I have none of the kind you call for." Comstock replied that he wished a copy specially of "The Lustful Turk," as he wished to send it to a friend in the country. Sullivan again assured him that he had nothing of the kind. Comstock put his money in his pocket and took his leave.

In February, 1873, Comstock caused the arrested of Sullivan and took him before a United States commissioner for sending information through the mails as to where improper books could be obtained. The Grand Jury, upon Comstock's evidence, found a bill: and at the trial in the January following, before Judge Benedict, upon Comstock's evidence, a verdict of guilty was easily obtained. Comstock swore that in March, 1872, he had sent a letter from Norwich, or Norwalk, Conn., in the name of Jerry Baxter, to Sullivan, asking for a circular of fancy literature, and that in return he had obtained a list of books of various kinds; but the list had no name or address upon it to show that it came from Sullivan. Judge Benedict, however, instructed the jury that the reception by Comstock of that circular and envelope, which he had carried in his pocket eleven months before he brought suit, was *prima facie* evidence of Sullivan's guilt. Upon this remarkable ruling, and upon Comstock's uncorroborated testimony, Sullivan was found guilty, and Benedict sentenced him to one year's imprisonment and a fine of $500. Sullivan is ready to take a solemn oath that he never sent the circular; that the writing on the envelope was not his at all, and that Comstock

perjured himself two or three times in giving evidence against him. But his business was broken up, he was made wretched, and disgraced for life, because Comstock swore that he had received under a fictitious name a catalogue without name or address! Is this the ultimate of American liberty?

3. Case of Leander Fox & Son.—These gentlemen kept a bookstore on Canal street, near West Broadway. They had been in business many years, and bore a first-class reputation. Mr. Fox, the elder, was advanced in years, and was probably as favorably known, so far as his acquaintance extended, as any man in the city. He had maintained an unblemished character. He had, of course, seen his share of the troubles and vicissitudes of life, but it was reserved for Anthony Comstock to bring this gray-haired old man to sorrow, to prison, and disgrace, and to this end he worked assiduously for several years. During all this time he called repeatedly at the store of Fox & Son and inquired for various obscene and indecent books. Mr. Fox invariably told the gentleman that he kept nothing of the kind, and never had.

Failing in finding anything there of the sort he is so fond of inquiring after, he resorted to his favorite expedient of writing a decoy letter in a false name and ordering a copy of a work upon which he could arrest him. He accordingly ordered a copy, to be sent by mail, of Dr. Ashton's "Book of Nature and Marriage Guide" (published and copyrighted by Benjamin T. Day), a work which had been sold regularly for twenty years and by nearly every dealer in the city. Upon receipt of the order, young Mr. Fox, not having a copy on hand, went out and bought a copy from the trade, and mailed it. The elder Mr. Fox did not see the order or the book. Comstock was doubtless filled with joy as his eyes fell upon the work thus received, and, "Now," thought he, "I have the game within my grasp that I have been lying in wait for so long." He lost little time in causing the arrest of father and son for being caught in the trap he had so skillfully set for them, and he had the extreme humanity to cause them to be arrested late on Saturday afternoon in a snow-storm, that they

might be unable at that late hour to procure bail, and thus have the ignominy of lying in prison over Sunday. This was a favorite game of Comstock's, and he has played it upon many occasions. But Mr. Fox, being so well known, was able to procure bail, and to evade the punishment that Comstock had so cunningly planned for him.

Messrs. Fox & Son employed the distinguished attorney, William A. Beach, to defend them, but Comstock managed to have the case brought on while Mr. Beach was at Albany, and they were thus placed at great disadvantage, and were unable even to procure such witnesses as they should have had. Under the circumstances, it was very little trouble for Comstock to swear both father and son into prison.

The jury, such as they know how to get up in the United States District Court, found them guilty, and sentenced them to prison for a year.

Think for a moment of the sad havoc such an event must have caused in their business, the sorrow and agony it must have created in their families. Think of the grief of the wife of the old gentleman, who had sojourned with him through life's trials, to have him cruelly torn from her by such a malicious hand and thrown into prison upon the disgraceful charge of dealing in obscene literature and sending it through the mails.

Fortunately for Mr. Fox, he had a warm friend in Thurlow Weed, who, as soon as he learned that his friends Fox & Son were in prison for selling a book of which many thousands had been previously sold, and having great influence with President Grant, succeeded in having both father and son pardoned out. "Kissing goes by favor," and when a man is in prison it is a lucky thing to have a friend who has influence at court, but when a poor man, without friends, gets into prison, no matter how unjust the conviction may be, he would have to serve his time out, though death might be his fate before it was over. As it was, Fox and his son had to lie several months in durance, and at a time, too, when another son was on his dying bed without the presence and care of

his father. Should the Fox family entertain the warmest affection for Anthony Comstock, who is such a special favorite with the Y. M. C. A. and the S. F. S. V.?

4. Case of Mrs. Woodhull and Miss Claflin.—These two sisters were, in 1872, publishing their "Weekly," a large sixteen-page paper, devoted to their peculiar views, and having a circulation of nearly ten thousand copies. They certainly had the same right to publish a paper that any other resident of the country possessed. They saw fit, in the fall of 1872, to publish intelligence in reference to what has since been known as the Beecher and Tilton scandal, but it was no more obscene than has been published in every daily paper in the city. Comstock caused their arrest in November, 1872. They were thrown into Ludlow Street Jail and their paper suppressed. Thus was a great wrong inflicted upon them as well as upon their numerous patrons in all parts of the country. They printed such a paper as their patrons approved of, and they had as much right to be served as any other portion of the community. Their paper was not only suppressed, but the printer and the stereotyper who did the work for the ladies were also arrested and subjected to great inconvenience.

Their bail was placed so high that they could not give it, and they were compelled to lie in prison many weeks prior to examination, the victims of the most bitter, intolerant spirit that ever ruled in this country. Their bail was divided up on different points, and, in the aggregate, is said to have amounted to over $80,000. It was the evident intention to keep them in prison without an examination, and thus suppress their paper.

In January, 1873, Mrs. Woodhull and Miss Claflin were again arrested and imprisoned, but, after several weeks, they were brought before Judge Blatchford of the U. S. Court, and he decided that they were illegally imprisoned, and that they had violated no law of the country. District Attorney Purdy proposed a *nolle prosequi* in the case, but their attorney objected, and the judge instructed the jury to find a

verdict of acquittal, thus disposing of the case once for all, and preventing the prisoners being arrested again on the same charge.

This prosecution from first to last was a piece of cruel oppression towards those two women, and was wholly uncalled for. They had done nothing to merit such treatment from the Government. It damaged them to the extent of at least $20.000, and though they have applied to Congress to reimburse them for the great wrong done them, nothing has been yet effected. These women were unable to recover from the loss that had been unjustly imposed upon them.

5. GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN was arrested in 1873 by Comstock on a charge of obscenity, and was thrown into the Tombs' damp, gloomy prison, where he lay in his close cell for six months. His offense consisted in publishing certain indecent passages from the Bible without a word of comment. It was evident that his accusers got ashamed of their conduct in arresting a highly intelligent man for publishing a limited number of extracts from the Bible in all their native purity. They wished to get him off their hands without a trial, but he refused to leave prison until duly tried and discharged. This they evaded. Finally, an order was issued from Albany to raze the unhealthy Tombs prison to the ground. Under this state of things Mr. Train left the prison, after which nothing was done toward tearing down the Tombs. To keep a citizen in prison so long, on so frivolous a charge, is a disgrace to the government and an outrage upon the rights of an American freeman.

6. CASE OF JOHN A. LANT.—In the spring of 1875 Mr. Lant moved his little paper, the "Toledo Sun," from Toledo, Ohio, to this city. It was a Freethought journal, and was far from immoral in its tone. It had not been here long, however, before it attracted the attention of Comstock, who resolved that it should be suppressed. He abused newsdealers on the sidewalk who presumed to sell the little paper, and he harshly threatened a friend of ours with imprisonment in the Tombs for selling the "Sun" containing Ingersoll's

"Oration on the Gods." After various devices, he sent an order to Mr. Lant for his paper, in the name of E. Semler, Green Farms, Conn., eulogizing the paper and urging Lant to press on in the good work he was doing. He ordered several back numbers, published before the paper was brought to New York. The most objectionable matter was a letter from Dr. E. P. Miller on physiological matters and a prayer by Train called "Beecher's Prayer." Some of the matter was not, perhaps, in the best possible taste, but there was nothing immoral in the papers.

Lant was thrown into Ludlow Street Jail and kept there two months, so as to effectually prevent the publication of his paper, and unexceptionable bail was refused. Finally, upon a writ of habeas corpus, Mr. Lant was removed from prison and admitted to bail, which was placed at $5,000. His final trial came off in December, his family suffering in the mean time for the very necessaries of life. His trial was short and severe. Comstock testified to writing the decoy letter in a fictitious name and receiving the "Sun" in return. The principal question raised at the trial was as to whether the matter objected to was obscene. The rulings of Judge Benedict were invariably against the accused. The charge to the jury was of the same hard, unfeeling character, and it was sufficient to induce a verdict of guilty, though not the slightest crime had been committed. The sentence was eighteen months at hard labor in the penitentiary at Albany, and $200 fine. Thus this man, in a feeble state of health, was torn from his wife and three little babes, who were wholly unprovided for, and at the commencement of winter. His prison life, with the labor that was imposed upon him, was very unfavorable to his health. He had, while there, some nineteen attacks of hemorrhage from the lungs and bronchial tubes. It is almost a marvel that he lived to serve out his time. When he returned to his family he was entirely without money and without business. This was an aggravated case, and shows to what length a spirit of persecution and intolerance may be carried in this so-called free America.

7. Case of Simpson.—This man kept a news and literary depot on Centre street, near Pearl street, for many years. It is not denied that he was an offender, and that in years past he sold works of an immoral character. It is not wished to defend him, or to apologize for him in this connection, but the case upon which he was tried and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment at hard labor, and a fine of five thousand dollars, seems one of extreme severity. Comstock got upon his track and was determined to place him in prison. He first caused his arrest for selling a card called the "picnic card," which was playful, but not immoral or vile. This was found insufficient. But not so a card referring to the marriage of Nellie Grant to Sartoris in the language of a naval engagement, without an absolutely obscene or immoral word in it. The issuing of this card which could not possibly do much harm to anybody, afforded sufficient grounds, under the laws of Congress, for Comstock to pursue the man, for the jury to find him guilty, and for the merciful Judge Benedict to sentence him to ten years' imprisonment at hard labor, and a fine of $5.000. In view of the trivial character of the offense, this seems to have been the severest sentence ever imposed in this country. Many a foul murderer, robber, thief, embezzler, defaulter, ravisher, calumniator, perjurer, or forger has gone scot-free, or with very insignificant punishment, while this man is compelled to spend ten years of his life in prison, at hard labor, with a fine of a sum larger than many earn in their whole lives hanging over him, and all for the selling of a card without an immodest word upon it. It seems almost incredible. Yet such is the truth. Under the Comstock laws almost anything is possible.

8. Case of Hunter & Co.—This firm does an extensive publishing business at Hinsdale, N. H. Their paper, "The Star Spangled Banner," has a wide circulation. They also sell many books and miscellaneous goods. Anthony Comstock let his evil eye rest upon them, and he plotted their overthrow. He commenced operations by writing decoy letters from New Jersey (probably Squan Village), ordering

a simple French arrangement, sometimes called a "safe." This was the first one sold, and also the last, and this was sent by mail for Comstock's special benefit, though ordered under a false name. Anthony, thus armed and equipped, visited Hinsdale and arrested Mr. Hunter and four of his clerks, and had them carried off to be examined, though the clerks had nothing to do with the matter. He also seized and carried off a portion of their property, and ransacked the entire place to see if he could find anything obscene with which to feast his morbid appetite, but he found nothing of an improper character.

After Mr. Hunter had thus been spirited away. Comstock showed his extreme honesty and truthfulness by going to Mr. Hunter's dwelling and saying to Mrs. Hunter, "Mr. Hunter says you are to give me that package of fancy books." She knew nothing of anything of the kind, for the very good reason that there was nothing of the kind there. But, to increase his glory and renown with the members of the societies to which he belongs, he caused to be published in the Boston dailies, with flaming headings, accounts of the enormous seizures of obscene matter he had made in Hinsdale, claiming that it was the headquarters for villainy in the State. This was evidently done to prejudice public sentiment against Mr. Hunter, and to make it appear that he, Comstock, was doing a tremendous business in making seizures of matter of the most vile character.

Hunter & Co. have reason to be thankful that their case was not tried before the United States Circuit Court in this city. Had Judge Benedict been the judge before whom it was tried, the sending of that one simple, trivial apparatus, under his stern rulings, might easily have cost them two or more years' imprisonment and a fine of from three to five thousand dollars. As it was, though the case was not pressed against them, it cost them thousands of dollars, to the almost utter ruin of their business and an amount of trouble and intense anxiety on the part of themselves and families that never can be fully estimated. The most cruel and heartless

part of the work of the informer in this case was his studied efforts to blacken their characters before the public by his false representations that tons of immoral and indecent matter were found upon their premises, when not the smallest part of it was true. Nothing immoral or obscene was found upon their premises, simply because it was not there. It is very easy to make false representations about others, and in this way to injure them to an incalculable extent; and a man who deliberately and maliciously does this, for the purpose of carrying out his own evil designs or to add to his own reputation and glory, ought to be shunned as the most dangerous fiend in the land.

9. DAVID MASSEY'S EXPERIENCE.—Mr. Massey was a merchant of St. Louis, and did a somewhat extensive and successful business until the war of the Rebellion. His business was largely in the South, and upon the breaking out of the war his trade was cut off, and thousands of dollars due him by his Southern customers could not be collected, and, like hundreds of others in similar cases, he was utterly ruined. He came to New York to find something to do. He obtained a clerkship with Rogers & Co., 737 Broadway, and there he became a victim to the wiles of Anthony Comstock, who sent a decoy letter to the house or to Mr. Massey, ordering some fancy pictures. Massey enclosed in an envelope a set of what were called "Black Crook" pictures, being representations of the ballet girls in costume as they appeared on the stage. Such pictures were very common in this city a few years ago, and stared passers-by in the face from scores of windows. A party who saw Massey put the pictures into the envelope will swear there was nothing obscene among them. But on the trial Comstock produced some very obscene pictures and swore he received them by mail from Massey. Mr. Massey contended in the strongest terms that Comstock committed perjury in his testimony against him, but it was sufficient to send him to prison for a year, with a fine of $500.

Without saying that Comstock committed perjury in this case, we can only say it was perfectly easy for him to do so.

Now it is submitted to the reader whether the liberty of American citizens is safe when a designing, dishonest, and unprincipled man, as Comstock has proved himself to be, and with a morbid fondness for sending people to prison, has the power, by his individual, uncorroborated testimony, to send hundreds of persons to prison, as he has publicly boasted of doing. It is extremely unsafe to place so much power as Comstock has wielded in the hands of a man like him.

The sister of Massey, heartbroken at the disgrace brought upon her brother and family, died, and was carried to an untimely grave. Mr. Massey left prison greatly impaired in health. He returned to St. Louis and was compelled to go to the hospital. When last heard from he was lying at the point of death. Another victim of the moral censor and spy, Anthony Comstock.

10. CASE OF DR. J. BOTT, AND OTHERS.—In the spring of 1872 Anthony Comstock made a trip to Washington and entered upon an enterprising, characteristic speculation, to which his talents and inclination so eminently adapt him. He rented post-office Box 260, provided himself with a lot of letter-heads belonging to the Treasury Department (which must have been dishonestly abstracted by himself or some other person), and wrote some eight or ten letters to as many physicians in this city. He assumed the character of a poor, unfortunate young girl who had been seduced and was in a condition to become a mother, and appealed in a most pitiful manner to those physicians to do something to relieve her. The following is a copy of the letter sent to one of the physicians, and upon comparison they were all found to be of the same tenor:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., March 18, 1873.

"DR. SELDEN—DEAR SIR: I am an employee of the Treasury and I have got myself into trouble. I was seduced about four months ago, and I am now about three months gone in the family way. The person who seduced me has run away and I do not know what will become of me if I do not get relief. I am a poor clerk and get only sixty dollars per month, and have to keep a widowed mother and a crippled sister, so that I send you all, in fact more than I can spare, hoping that you will send me something that will relieve me.

"Now, dear Doctor, send it right away, and send it by mail, for I do not

want any one to have a breath of suspicion about the matter. For God's sake do not disappoint a poor ruined and forsaken girl whose only relief will be suicide if you fail me.

"Yours faithfully, Miss Anna E. Ray.

"Please send package by mail to 'E. A. R.,' Box 260, Washington, D. C., and have it securely sealed."

Twenty dollars were placed in each letter and the same registered, so the parties receiving them were obliged to sign a receipt before obtaining the letter.

Letters of the same character were on the same day mailed to Dr. J. Bott, 84 Amity street; Dr. Alex. R. King, 10 Amity street; Dr. Dubois, 38 Great Jones street; Dr. Andrews, 45 Bleecker street; Dr. Marcus Jacoby, 161 Bleecker street. Dr. C. W. Selden, 67 Amity street. Such a cry of distress would move many a sympathetic heart to do something to afford relief, though no money was enclosed, but the two together were supposed sufficient to affect the stoutest heart.

Some of the physicians named suspected this was a "put up" case and sent nothing; others sent simple preparations, not calculated to produce any specific change in the person taking them, whether male or female. Others again, sent emmenagogue medicines adapted to the nature of the case.

Dr. Bott sent a simple powder of oxide of bismuth and powdered gentian, which is a simple stomachic and would not harm a woman in any condition. The prescription for the powder was filled at the drug-store on the corner of Sullivan and McDougal streets.

One of the physicians sent a box of common purgative pills, one sent pills and a decoction, and some, as observed, sent nothing. Comstock, having caught his game in the trap he had so skillfully set, came on to New York, feline-like, to play with them. He had all the physicians arrested who had sent him any medicines to get him out of the unpleasant condition which he represented himself to be in, and in due time they were brought to trial, convicted, and sent to prison. Dr. Jacoby was an exception; he had money. By paying $1,500 he escaped a trial and consequent imprisonment.

How much of that sum Anthony Comstock got, and where the balance found a lodging place, is not generally known.

When Dr. Bott was arrested he was cast into Ludlow Street Jail, where he lay six months before his trial came off, and when it did take place, it was a very summary affair. Comstock exhibited the registered letter receipt which Dr. Bott signed, a copy of the letter written, and the bismuth and gentian powder which the doctor sent him. Judge Benedict ruled that no other testimony was necessary, and refused to allow Dr. Bott, through his attorney, James D. McClelland, Esq., to introduce testimony to show the simple nature of the powder sent, which he wished to do by the druggist who prepared it. He ruled that the doctor's sending any powder in response to Comstock's fraudulent decoy letter was *prima facie* evidence of his guilt, and peremptorily charged the jury to find a verdict of guilty, which they did without leaving their seats.

The sentence of Dr. Bott was eighteen months in Crow Hill penitentiary, Brooklyn, which, with the six months in Ludlow Street Jail, made two years, for the heinous crime of sending through the mail a simple stomachic powder, and which he never would have sent had not Comstock decoyed him to do so.

One who has not tasted the bitterness of prison life cannot fully appreciate its ills. Dr. Bott lost an arm in the late war. Being naturally a man of fine sensibilities, he was broken down and crushed by the weight of the great misfortune that befell him, and so were his family. They were disgraced and outraged. The doctor's health gave way under the hardship and deprivation of prison life. He was sick while in prison, and came out a mere wreck of his former self. He subsequently passed a considerable portion of his time in hospitals; his health was ruined and his spirit completely broken down. In December, 1877, the writer visited his bedside during the closing hours of his life. He died the following night. As the writer watched him drawing his few remaining breaths, he instinctively exclaimed, "This is but another result of the

American Inquisition. This is the finale of another unfortunate victim of Anthony Comstock's cruelty and greed." This case of Dr. Bott's is thought to be at least the twentieth in which Comstock, by his relentless prosecutions and persecutions, has sent the victim to an untimely grave as surely as though he had shot him or stabbed him to the heart.

11. Case of Mr. Kendall.—This man was a dealer in rubber goods. Comstock, by a decoy letter, induced Kendall to send him by mail a rubber female syringe, a useful and valuable instrument. For this enormous crime he was arrested and disgraced, thrown into prison, kept there for six months, and his business entirely ruined.

12. Case of Mr. Weil.—This gentleman was a photographer, pursuing the even tenor of his way on Broadway, New York, not far from Twelfth street. He was a quiet, well-disposed citizen, but Comstock fain would ruin him. Comstock, in person, or by his deputy, visited his gallery in search of improper photographs. Weil informed him that he made nothing of the kind. "But will you make them if I bring you the negatives?" "No, sir; I wish to do nothing of the kind." But finally Comstock discovered in the gallery an artistic photograph which Weil had taken of his own little boy in undress. This, in Comstock's eyes, was a heinous offense against the peace and morality of the country. The photographer's negatives were seized, his property carried off, and he was subjected to much trouble and considerable expense.

In a similar way many photograph galleries were raided, and negatives and apparatus to the value of thousands of dollars forcibly carried away. The censor and protector of public morals deemed photographs of classic statuary and paintings grossly obscene, and this was a sufficient incentive for him to seize and remove negatives, instruments, etc. In this way many photographers were seriously wronged.

It is reported that victims have been arrested, tried, and imprisoned for sending through the mails photographs and prints of statuary like Power's Greek Slave, the original of

which hundreds of thousands have viewed with the purest and grandest emotions of pleasure.

13. Case of Dr. William Morrison. — One of Comstock's feats was bringing this worthy gentleman into serious trouble. He is an Englishman, but was twenty years in this city, and is most respectably connected, both in England and in this country. He kept a drug-store at 515 Pearl street, and connected with that store for many years had been a trade in what was called "French Remedies and Goods." Comstock had his evil eye, or possibly his pious eye, on the doctor, and secretly worked his downfall. He wrote letters simulating a young lady in the upper part of the city, asking for certain articles forbidden by the laws to be sent through the mails, to which the doctor promptly replied that the trade was in violation of law and he would have nothing to do with it.

In October, 1877, Comstock renewed his epistolary correspondence with Dr. Morrison. This time he simulated a young lady by the name of Ella Bender, of Squan Village, N. J. She wrote a very confidential letter to the doctor and asked for some information or some remedy that would prevent her being unfortunately caught should she be exposed. The doctor simply enclosed in an envelope an old leaf of an advertisement referring to Hooper's Female Pills, which have been a standard medicine for a hundred years, and are not capable of doing much good or harm.

"Miss Ella" again wrote more affectionately and confidentially to the doctor, speaking to him in very endearing language, chiding him for his want of gallantry in not writing her and signing his name to the letter. She in plain language informed the doctor that she was under the necessity of making a living in the best way she could, and that sometimes she had to do certain things a little against her will, and she wished him to send her some of those "French appliances" that would keep her safe and sound. He replied that it was against the law to send anything of the kind by mail, and he should not do so. Again she wrote the doctor, growing still more affectionate and urgent in her appeals, and

informing him that her sister would probably buy some of the same kind of goods if he would send her one of his circulars. She wrote four letters in all, at which time the doctor was so far seduced by her artfulness as to send her a pessary and a "safe."

This was enough to do the business. The crafty hypocrite and falsifier had met with the success which his heart coveted. He at once took steps to arrest the doctor with the view of immuring him within the walls of a prison. He visited the doctor's place of business, accompanied by a United States deputy-marshal who had borne him company upon many a similar errand of cruelty, heartlessness, injustice, and terror. It was soon made apparent that Miss Ella Bender, the Squan Village girl who wanted to buy some "French fixings" that she might engage in certain liaisons without danger to herself, and Mr. Anthony Comstock, the eminent Christian, the noted agent, inquisitor, and detective for the United States Government, the agent and secretary of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, and the pet champion of the Y. M. C. A., were one and the same person. Miss Ella, instead of being a dashing, fascinating brunette of the female persuasion, turned out to be a coarse, burly, hard-cheeked, sandy-haired, merciless masculine, with a frightful scar on the left side of his face inflicted while he was making an illegal arrest by the one-armed Conroy.

While on that friendly call at the doctor's, Comstock, in rummaging a private drawer in a writing-table, played the sharp game of abstracting the letters which the sweet "Ella" had written to her "Dear Doctor," and carried them away with him.

The information respecting this case was obtained from Dr. Morrison, direct. He was duly indicted and tried, before Judge Benedict and a verdict of guilty, upon Comstock's evidence, was rendered against him. At the instance of the doctor's lawyer, sentence was deferred, and the doctor, fearing it might be too severe, determined to forfeit his bail and leave for Europe, so Comstock did not have the pleasure of send-

ing this man to prison. Dr. Morrison stated emphatically that Comstock in giving his evidence in the case perverted the truth. Whether or not this was so the writer has no means of knowing; but putting on the best possible construction of the case in Comstock's favor, it was one of criminal duplicity, falsehood, and intrigue; Comstock used decoy letters, false signatures, and so forth, and induced the old doctor to commit an offense that he otherwise would not have thought of committing.

14. Case of Charles Conroy.—Conroy is a one-handed man, having been born without a right hand. He made a living by selling books and pamphlets, mostly of Dick & Fitzgerald's publications, being song books, dream books, books of games, letter writers, books of etiquette, and so forth. He did business in this city, and also in Newark, N. J. It was in the latter city that Comstock commenced his attack upon him. Conroy did an advertising business, and had letters sent to him in different names. Comstock, deeming this a great offense, applied to the U. S. Commissioner in Newark for a warrant for the arrest of Conroy. The Commissioner, however, not deeming the matter complained of as being sufficient to justify the issuing of a warrant, refused to do so, whereupon Comstock decided to arrest Conroy without a warrant. He accordingly arrested him without the slightest color of authority, taking him forcibly and hustling him into a covered carriage, and drove off without ceremony, and took him before the commissioner, who held him for examination. While Conroy was being conveyed to prison he told Comstock that he had arrested him without the slightest authority and with no warrant. Comstock's reply was, "If I do not succeed in convicting you on this arrest, I will follow you up until I get you into prison." As they neared the prison and Conroy saw its grim walls looming up before him, he remembered his wife and child at home, and how they would be left to suffer while he was immured within prison walls, and he realized how unjust and cruel the arrest was. He took his little pocket-knife, the only weapon he had, and with his left

hand gave Comstock one blow upon his left cheek, cutting a bad gash nearly two inches in length. Comstock recovering himself, hastily pulled his pistol from his pocket and placed it at Conroy's head, and at that instant the carriage door was opened and the jailer appeared with another pistol, which he also presented unpleasantly near Conroy's head. Thus, with a pistol on each side of his head, the overpowered man with a single hand, deemed submission the wiser part and, he was placed in a cell. He was tried upon the charge of committing an atrocious assault upon an officer. Comstock, of course, appeared against him and with his testimony obtained a verdict of two years' imprisonment in the State prison at Trenton. On the day the prisoner was sentenced, some twenty of Comstock's bosom friends, members of the Young Men's Christian Association, went from New York to Newark to witness the interesting proceedings. And when the prisoner had been conducted to the State prison at Trenton, Comstock took the trouble to make a journey there to impress upon the keeper or warden that Conroy was a very dangerous man and ought to be kept in the closest confinement, in pursuance of which advice Conroy was confined in a very close uncomfortable cell during the hottest weather. When his term had expired, and before he had left the steps of the prison, Comstock was on hand, and had him again arrested on the original charge of receiving letters in a fictitious name, had him tried, convicted, and sentenced to another year in prison. This statement was obtained from Conroy himself.

The cut which he inflicted on Comstock's face was somewhat serious, bleeding badly on his way home and weakening him considerably. But his Christian friends being very sympathetic with him, in consideration of the great peril he had been placed in, and the danger he had incurred in the cause of morality and justice, made him up a purse of several thousand dollars for his great suffering and loss of blood. This entire case was one of aggravated injustice and wrong.

Comstock's attention has not been wholly given to suppressing dealers in contraband literature and tabooed articles.

He has been as much opposed to physicians and medical authors who presumed to write and publish medical works heterodox in character as to heterodoxy in religion. He has worked as much in the interests of the "regular" school of physicians as of the regular school of theologians. Let it once be known that a physician was publishing a popular medical work, which presumed to step aside from the beaten track of regular practice and Comstock considered him as his legitimate "game." He pursued such with the same relentless rapacity as other classes of offenders. A few such cases will be given as samples of many others for which there hardly is room.

15. Case of Dr. E. B. Foote.—This was an instance where the greatest injustice and cruelty were inflicted upon one of the purest, best, and most amiable of men, whose life has been spent in instructing and improving his fellow-beings by giving them such information as is well calculated to aid them to be more healthy, more happy, and better and more useful men and women. His medical works possess the highest value, and have been introduced into hundreds of thousands of families, which to-day stand ready to bear testimony to the great benefit they have derived from the physiological, hygienic, and moral lessons which he has so ably imparted.

His character is elevated, and his desire is to elevate and benefit his fellow-beings. In his medical experience, running over a third of a century, no man can truthfully charge him with an action prompted by an improper motive, or with an attempt to procure an abortion or anything of the kind. His course has been singularly free from everything of the kind, and it is only alluded to because of the efforts on the part of a cruel persecutor and prosecutor to cast this vile stigma upon him. The cries of "mad dog" and "abortionist" are easily raised by those who would willingly inflict wrong upon the deserving; but how unjust to do so when there is not the slightest grounds for such conduct!

Dr. Foote was an unfortunate victim of a designing,

unscrupulous, relentless persecutor. Because he has been considered not fully *orthodox* in his medical status, because he has presumed to give highly valuable instruction as to how some of the greatest evils of society may be morally and legitimately obviated, the ire of his prosecutor was aroused against him. He was seized as a criminal and as a disseminator of unclean literature; he was falsely charged; he was obliged to give bail to avoid being thrust into prison; the most intense anxiety and unhappiness were forced upon him, upon his estimable wife, his aged mother, who resides with him, and upon his children and his friends; he was forced to stand trial in a court where the utmost severity is the rule, and where the strict construction of an unjust law was made to bear heavily upon him; thousands upon thousands of dollars were stripped from him; his business injured to the extent of fully $25,000, and an amount of that intense anxiety and apprehension which cannot be estimated by dollars and cents, and which no person can realize who has not been made to experience it. All this has been brought upon a man who had not committed a fault—who had not done the first thing towards violating the laws of honor, virtue, or morality.

For some twenty years Dr. Foote has employed the few moments he could snatch from professional labors in writing such physiological works as he sincerely believed were needed by the people—in 1857–8, "Medical Common Sense;" in 1869–70, "Plain Home Talk," embracing the main features of the first book; in 1874–5, "Science in Story," which has received commendation, not only from the secular but from the religious press. Thus far the work has received no adverse criticism. In these works, and in pamphlets issued from time to time, the doctor has labored to show the necessity of improving humanity by having no children born the creatures of accident; in other words, has treated indirectly and directly, in nearly all the works he has written, on the importance of scientific propagation, no less in the human family than on the stock-farm. That is to say, this has been one feature of his writings. The consideration of this

important subject naturally led to the devising and prescribing of effective means for making what John Stuart Mill called "conjugal prudence" possible in all cases wherein disease was to be entailed on offspring, or indeed in all instances wherein the reproductive function might better be rendered inoperative. This information was imparted in a pamphlet entitled "Words in Pearl for the Married," which was prepared for the purpose of answering a score of questions which are asked daily of a physician in extensive practice. To make it as unobjectionable as possible, it was set up in pearl type, so as to make it only thirty-two pages of about the size of a letter envelope, in which it was invariably sent *sealed, under letter postage*. Its object in great part was to save letter-writing when questions were asked, which its pages directly answered. The pamphlet took strong grounds against producing miscarriage or abortion. When the postal obscene-literature law was passed, some of its pages, referring to the prevention of conception, in conflict with the new statute, were promptly expurgated. Shortly after the Congressional law was enacted, a similar one was passed in our own State, forbidding the devising or supplying of any means whatever for the prevention of conception. The doctor was assured by his legal adviser that this clause would never be enforced against physicians: but not being a member of the conservative school of medicine, and his advice often being sought upon a subject so intimately connected with his pet hobby of scientific propagation, he thought best to put himself upon a legal footing both in respect to the Congressional and State laws. In doing this he followed legal advice.

Nevertheless, in January, 1876, he was suddenly and unexpectedly called upon to give bonds in the sum of $5,000 for his appearance before the United States Court, an indictment having been found against him, at the instigation of Mr. Comstock, for sending an alleged obscene pamphlet and notices of preventive articles through the United States mail. It appears that these were sent, in answer to a decoy letter, to a Mrs. Semler in Chicago, who, in her application, expressed

great admiration for the doctor's "Plain Home Talk." Orders of this character, however, seldom came to the personal notice of the doctor. They belonged to the order department, where the clerk in charge had, without consultation with or permission from his employer, sufficiently changed his arrangements to place him in a questionable position before this iron-clad law. First, it was confidently believed a *nolle prosequi* would be entered by the prosecuting attorney: next that the indictment would be quashed; and finally, when the case came unexpectedly to trial, on the twenty-first of June, acquittal was fully expected up to the moment when the jury retired for their decision on the twenty-sixth; even the prosecuting attorney, it is said, looked for nothing better for his side than a disagreement of the jury. It was, therefore, a matter of great surprise when the jury, after an absence of only twenty minutes, returned with a verdict of guilty! The rulings of the judge were peculiar. The defense, while believing that the pamphlet was not obscene, considered it a strong point that the publication was only sent through the mails sealed and under letter postage. Judge Benedict in his charge turned this point against the defense by saying substantially that those who would not buy such a work over a counter could obtain it in a sly way through the mails. Although the order clerk distinctly testified that he had sent the notice through the mails on his own responsibility, and with no permission from his employer, the judge charged that the principal should be held responsible the same as a bank officer would be for a notice of protest issued by a subordinate! Judge Benedict further said that medical works need not be sent by mail; that they could be sent by express; seeming to ignore the fact that the peculiar statute not only prohibited certain publications from going through the mails, but any notices in print or writing stating where such publications could be obtained.

After the rendition of the verdict, bail was doubled to $10,000, for which the doctor must find bondsmen or go to prison. Counsel were sure that Judge Benedict under the circum

stances would not impose a fine of perhaps more that $100. The prisoner was a physician; the pamphlet was nothing more than advice which is orally given by every well-known practitioner to his inquiring patients. These circumstances, together with the unauthorized character of the notices, would be considered.

The judge was urged by personal appeal and written to by anxious friends and patients of the doctor to deal leniently with him. Among the letters passed through the hands of his attorneys to Judge Benedict was one from an ex-governor, who said he knew the prisoner to be "an excellent citizen, a man of studious habits and pure life;" one from a physician of prominence in the homœopathic school, a professor in one of its universities, and a high officer in one of its societies, who said he was satisfied of Dr. Foote's "genial humanitarianism, keen intellect, and honest purpose:" one from an independent physician, graduate of a first-class allopathic university, and ex-professor of several medical universities, who remarked that "physicians generally agree that the pamphlet contains nothing but candid and rational answers to questions usually asked," and so forth; one from a noted clergyman, who expressed his hearty approval of the Doctor's publications, including his pamphlet, and who said he had placed two sets of "Science in Story" in his Sunday-school library: one from a sculptor whose work in artistic bronze beautifies one of the rambles in Central Park: one from an old and honored publisher, who originally brought out Harriet Beecher Stowe's "Uncle Tom's Cabin;" one from a professor high in the eclectic medical profession, together with many others, all testifying to the fact that the doctor was entitled to mercy. On the eleventh day of July, while thousands of people were crowding the Centennial Exposition in commemoration of the birth of this great *free* republic, Dr. Foote was fined $3.500 for publishing a little work which a large number of intelligent and reputable physicians and thousands of good people throughout the United States believed to contain only such information as at least every adult had a right to know!

(Sentence was not passed for sending the notices.) It was fully believed by the doctor and his friends that this victim of a clumsy statute barely escaped the State prison! The fine and costs of defense exceeded $5,000. The developments during the trial led many to the conviction that the law and its agents were being employed by conservative members of the profession to destroy a Liberal medical writer and practitioner. Circumstances have come to the knowledge of the doctor since the summer of 1876 which have led him reluctantly to believe that these suspicions, in which he was too charitable at the time to share, were well founded. At all events, it was a case of great injustice and illiberal tyranny on the part of a bigoted Christian society and their overzealous agent.

16. Case of Dr. E. C. Abbey.—Dr. Abbey is a resident of the city of Buffalo, and is a gentleman of the highest intelligence and moral worth. He graduated in 1861, thus having been a legal medical practitioner for more than a sixth of a century. He is a prominent member of the Masonic fraternity, and enjoys a first-class reputation among the wide number who know him, and is thoroughly indorsed by the best men of all classes in whose midst he has dwelt for many years.

He has written and published a work on the sexual system and its derangements. Sexual diseases have been made a specialty by him; which study was induced by what he witnessed in this connection while pursuing his collegiate studies. When about to issue his work, he placed the manuscript in the hands of the district attorney, who pronounced it legal and not in conflict with any law. After its publication he submitted it to the best medical counsel in the State of New York, as well as the best legal talent, including the Hon. Daniel F. Day and others, who pronounced the work all right from a legal point of view and one whose circulation would, as calculated, do a great amount of good. He had not the slightest motive to issue an improper or an immoral book, and he took every precaution to obtain legal and able coun-

sel upon the subject. A copy was taken to U. S. Commissioner Fillmore, son of ex-President Fillmore, who declined to entertain the case at all. Before another commissioner the result was different. Anthony Comstock's attention was called to Dr. Abbey's work, and, as it imparts to the masses information upon the important subjects of human physiology and the laws of health, he decided it was an improper work to receive mail facilities. His detective commenced operations. Decoy letters were employed. Dr. Abbey sent a copy of this work to Comstock, giving all the facts about its publication, the names of men of standing who had endorsed the doctor's character, and asked the conservator of the public morals of America to state his objections to it. He assured Comstock also that an arrest and trial were unnecessary: that he was ready to make any modification deemed necessary.

It was perhaps an error on the part of Dr. Abbey to take this course. He was arrested and his books seized as obscene. This was unquestionably a high-handed outrage. They should not have been seized as obscene until pronounced to be of that character by proper legal authorities. Comstock, however, considered himself competent to decide what is obscene, and any popular work designed to circulate among the masses, and which gave any information upon the subject of human physiology, he pronounced obscene. He has said, in his very positive and offensive manner, "No works on physiology shall be allowed to go through the mails." The rights and liberties of American citizens have indeed sunk to a low point if a man of the very moderate literary and scientific acquirements of Anthony Comstock shall become censor of the public press and the United States mail, and shall have the power to say what books the people may read, and what they may not read, what they may send and receive through the mail, and what not! Was it for this kind of liberty that our fathers fought and bled in the days of the Revolution? Was it for this kind of universal freedom that the great struggle was made to sustain our Government in the late rebellion?

The wrong thus perpetrated against Dr. Abbey by seizing his property and holding it without legal authority was continued nearly three years, his books, as understood, being thus wrongfully and unjustly detained. When taken before Judge Wallace of the U. S. District Court, Dr. Abbey very promptly admitted that he had deposited his medical work in the mail and that he was proud of having done so, regarding the same distinctly as his right and duty. He raised objections to the indictment as not being specific, and claimed firmly but respectfully that his work was not in any sense an obscene book. The jury that tried him were fresh from their barns and firesides, and were unfortunately of a class incompetent to judge of the merits of a medical work. They had not, in fact, read enough of works of that kind to constitute them capable judges of their true merits. The District Attorney read a few isolated passages which, to the unlettered minds of such a jury as are often seen sitting to try matters they do not understand, sounded plain and reprehensible, and late on Saturday evening, when they were tired and anxious to return home, they readily decided the case adversely, and in five minutes found that valuable medical work an obscene book.

This was another instance of high-handed outrage upon a worthy citizen who presumed to impart information to his fellow-beings that they ought to have and which he was fully able to give. But he was not within the medical "ring," and hence his troubles.

Other physicians in St. Louis, Indianapolis, and other cities, have been annoyed in a similar way by Comstock, suffering heavy damages at his hands, but their cases will be passed over.

To enable this representative of the Young Men's Christian Association to perform his dirty work, he has found it necessary to have an accomplice and assistant. The person who has filled this position is Joseph A. Britton, alias Cohen, alias Andrews, alias Levy, etc. He is said to be a renegade Jew, who now claims to be a member of a Christian church. That he is base enough to be a fitting tool and companion to

Anthony Comstock there cannot be the slightest doubt. The two have worked together to ensnare and beguile unwary persons to commit offenses for which they could be arraigned before the American Inquisition, the United States Courts. Often has Britton endeavored to buy obscene books and pictures, and often has he filled his pockets with the vile trash and tried to sell them to simple-minded dealers. If the talent and industry these two men have given to the execrable business they have engaged in could have been bestowed in a more worthy direction, it would have been far better for them and all concerned. They are eminently worthy of each other. A few cases which the spies and informers have jointly worked up, will be given:

17. Case of John Manning.—Manning is a young man, and, in 1875, started a little news and literary stand on the corner of New Chambers and Pearl streets. He had been open but a short time when he received visits from Comstock's assistant, Britton. He bought papers, etc., of Manning, and called in from week to week, until he became well acquainted, and was regarded by Manning as a friend. Britton on one occasion asked for fancy photographs. Manning told him he had none, and that he had never dealt in anything of the kind. "But," said Britton, "cannot you get some for me? If you have an opportunity to pick up any, save them for me, and I will pay you a good price." This request was repeated several times, and Manning told him if he saw anything of the kind he would get them. Some time after this he had an opportunity to buy some photographs of nude figures, statuary, etc., and thinking they might suit his friend Britton, he purchased them for him. He did not deem it best to keep them in his store, but put them in his trunk at his boarding-house. Britton called soon after and was told he had some photographs for him. "Keep them," said Britton; "I will call again and take them." When he next called, Comstock accompanied him, and remained outside the place while his accomplice went in to work the ruin of young Manning. The latter told the villain Britton

that the pictures were not in his store, and that he would have to lock up his place and go over to his lodging-house, which he did, Britton accompanying him. As soon as he got outside, Britton signaled to Comstock that he had the pictures, and Comstock immediately arrested the unsuspecting young man, without a warrant or the slightest authority, and dragged him off to prison. The trial and conviction followed in due time. Comstock appeared against the accused, and swore that certain pictures were taken off the person of Manning which Manning affirms he never saw till Comstock produced them in court and swore them on to him. Manning will take his oath that this is the truth. He was sentenced to one year's imprisonment; and a stigma and disgrace was thus designedly and shamefully placed upon the young man that will injure him for life. It is a most disgraceful charge to be imprisoned for selling obscene pictures. One thing, however, is certain, this young man would not have thought of engaging in that kind of traffic had he not been repeatedly urged to do so by the accomplice of this agent for the Y. M. C. A. and the Society for the Suppression of Vice.

18. Case of A. Prosch.—Mr. Prosch is a worthy gentleman, sixty-four years of age. His life has been beyond reproach and singularly free from all objectionable practices. He has never drank liquor or used tobacco, he has never attended theatres, or played a game of cards, and has been unusually careful to avoid bad company and to shun even the appearance of evil. He has lived a quiet, unobtrusive life, and no one can justly speak ill of him. He is an artistic mechanic and manufacturer of stereopticons or magic-lanterns. He was formerly in business in Chatam Square, and is now on the corner of Division and Catherine streets, New York. His shop is filled with lathes and other implements and machinery with which, with one or two assistants, he manufactured the instruments that so highly interest and instruct thousands of people.

In the spring of 1877 he was induced by Mr. Daniel Walford, an active member of two temperance organizations, to

attend their social society meeting and edify them with the exhibition of one of his stereopticons. It was not his custom to exhibit his instruments in this way; in fact, this was the first instance of the kind. He was simply a manufacturer; but in this instance, to amuse a social party of temperance people, he consented to spend an evening with them and minister to their pleasure; and this he did without fee or compensation. The pictures used were chaste and moral, a portion of which were of statuary and ancient paintings, embracing, of course, some nude figures; none were from life. Many gentlemen and their wives were present, and everybody was pleased, and none were in the least shocked by the exhibition. There was, however, one person present whose impure mind caught at the idea that as nude figures from statuary, and so forth, had been represented, it would be a good chance for Comstock to work up a case. He reported the affair to Britton, the accomplice and confidential assistant of Comstock, who at an early moment communicated the intelligence to his master, and he was instructed to give his attention to the case and to work it up. Britton visited Mr. Prosch and said, with words of lying hypocrisy in his mouth, "I understand, Mr. Prosch, that a few evenings ago you gave before a temperance society a very interesting exhibition of pictures and engravings with one of your instruments. Now, I called to see you about giving a similar exhibition before a political club to which I belong. We are going to have a special meeting soon, and I wish to engage you to be with us with your stereopticon and pictures." To which Mr. Prosch replied, "It is not my business to exhibit my instruments; I manufacture them. I went the other evening to please and amuse some friends, and it is the only instance where I have done so." "Well," said Britton, "I hope you will not refuse also to come for us. We will pay you liberally for your time and trouble, and you will afford us much amusement."

Mr. Prosch thus importuned, and thinking perhaps he could make a few dollars for the evening's labor, consented to go, whereupon Britton plied the unsuspecting man on this

tack: "Now, you see our club is composed mostly of young men, and we are fond of something rich and a little gay. Those pictures you have exhibited are well enough, but can't you get something for us a little 'stronger' or more fancy?" "No," said Mr. Prosch, "I don't know that I can. Those are all the pictures I have." "But, my friend," said the detective, "we are willing to pay you liberally if you will get something to please us. Can you not make an effort to find something of the style we want?" "Well, yes; maybe so," answered the old man, weakening, perhaps, at the thought of making an extra dollar or two. "I will try and see what I can do for you." The Christian detective said he would call again.

In a short time the detective called again, in fact, he called several times on this business, and was very importunate and looked over the addition the manufacturer had made to his stock, with which he pronounced himself well pleased. He then renewed the engagement for their exhibition before his club, to take place on a certain night.

Then the vigilant detective reported to his chief, the veritable Comstock, how successfully he had roped in the old man, and how he had induced him to procure pictures that might be called obscene. Comstock soon put in an appearance at the old man's shop and asked to see the pictures, saying he was one of the club before which he was to exhibit. When this agent of the Christian Association had piously inspected the pictures which the old man had, which his hypocritical tool had persuaded the good man to procure, and which he never would have purchased save for such persuasion, he, like a fiend, turned upon the innocent, harmless old man, and said: "Now I have you. You are my prisoner. Accompany me at once."

Mr. Prosch was working at his lathe, in his shirt-sleeves and slippers, with his apron on. Said he, "If I must go with you, let me put on my coat and boots, and not be compelled to go through the streets in this way." "No," replied Comstock, imperiously; "come along at once, or I will prefer the additional charge against you of resisting an officer of the

Government." And thus that inoffensive old man of sixty-four years was, on a cold day in April, compelled by Comstock to march along the streets of this city without his coat; and, when one of his employees followed with it, Comstock would not allow the old man to stop and put it on: and not until he reached the police station and was placed in the charge of a policeman was a kind word spoken to him or was he allowed to put on his coat to keep out the cold.

The arrest was made late in the afternoon, and when he had been examined before the proper authorities it was too late to procure bail, and Mr. Prosch was compelled to pass the night in the Oak street station house. There was nothing in his cell to sleep upon save a hard plank, and in his perturbed state of mind at the sudden change in his fortunes, he trod his narrow cell all night, without a moment's sleep coming to his eyelids. This was purposely planned by the agent of the Young Men's Christian Association; and, as it turned out, the unhappy old man had to pass the second night in that dismal cell before acceptable bail could be procured. In the meantime Mr. Prosch's invalid wife was rendered extremely wretched by the absence of her husband, and that he was detained upon such a disgraceful charge. She could not bear to have her nearest friends know what the charge was, and the grief she felt nearly crushed her into the grave. She has, with tears, described to the writer the extreme grief the event caused her, and she did not believe she could live to pass through another such trial.

The case duly went before the grand jury, and a bill was found against Mr. Prosch. But the affair is still unsettled, after having cost the old man a great amount of anxiety, damaging his reputation, nearly breaking up his business, and costing him fully a thousand dollars in money he was illy able to spare. It is still held in terror over his head, and nearly destroys his happiness and that of his sick wife, who, if her husband is convicted upon so disgraceful a charge, will be hurried to her grave. When Mr. Walford, his wife, and other prominent members of the temperance organization,

went to Mr. Comstock with the endeavor to soften his severity towards the poor, unfortunate man, and said that they persuaded him to exhibit his pictures before their society, that he had charged nothing, and that there was not the slightest impropriety in the exhibition, and that both gentlemen and ladies were highly pleased with it, they found this protector of American decency and morality implacable and unyielding, and he seemed determined to pursue the harmless old man to the very death for committing what he (Comstock) was pleased to consider a crime, and which the old man would never have thought of committing had he not been persuaded into it by Comstock's own directions and by one of his own lackeys.

Friends of Mr. Prosch also called upon Mr. Samuel Colgate, president of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, and laid before him the outrageous manner in which Comstock had managed this case. Mr. Colgate was evidently appalled at the deception and unfeeling cruelty that had been practiced upon the old man, and through his efforts the case was pigeon-holed and has never been called up.

This affair is a disgrace to American liberty and Christian morality; and few of the cases of persecution in the past centuries, considering the time and place, were more criminal, cruel, and relentless.

19. Case of Charles F. Blandin.—This gentleman is a lawyer, and, in 1877, moved from Boston to New York, with the intention of following his profession in the metropolis; but finding business dull, he temporarily engaged at canvassing for a stationary and printing house. While thus employed he unfortunately called at the office of Anthony Comstock. Here he found the accomplice, Britton, who was exceedingly affable and talkative, and, ere the interview was closed, he made known his desire to procure some fancy pictures, and handed Blandin a card, which read thus, "Joseph B. Andrews, buyer of rare, rich, and racy books and photographs, &c., Philadelphia," representing himself to be Andrews, and a dealer in that kind of goods. Blandin

replied that he dealt in nothing of the kind, and knew nothing about such goods. Britton repeatedly urged him to try and find something of the kind, and extracted a promise from him that if he (Blandin) succeeded in finding anything of the kind he would let Britton know.

Some two months after this Blandin made a visit to Boston and upon meeting an old friend was casually shown some six or eight fancy photographs. They were the first he had ever seen. The promise he had made to Britton come to his mind and he begged his friend to lend him one of the pictures to show to Britton on his return to New York. When he did return he called at 150 Nassau street, but finding Britton out he left a note, saying he had called to fulfill his promise. Soon after this Britton called at Blandin's office and left a note requesting Blandin to call again, at an hour named, at 150 Nassau street. Unfortunately, Blandin called. Comstock and Britton were both in. They were much pleased with the picture, and wanted a thousand. Blandin informed them he had but the one, which he had borrowed to show Andrews, as he had promised, and that he must return that to its owner, and that was all he would have, saying it was not for sale, and that he knew not where they could be obtained. He replaced the picture in his pocket and started to leave, but was called back and further plied with questions. Britton took possession of the picture, and, upon Blandin's reaching out his hand to regain possession of it, Britton, instead of returning the picture, put thirty cents in Blandin's hand, saying "I want to keep this picture. You can obtain all of them you want; here are thirty cents to pay you for the trouble of bringing this in." Blandin refused to accept the money, and demanded his picture, offering the money back. At this juncture Comstock stepped from his private room or office and interrupted the dispute. He brandished a club and exhibited his badge of office, and, placing his hand in a ruffianly manner upon Blandin's shoulder, said: "You are my prisoner; my name is Comstock. Now tell me where you obtained that picture." Although Blandin might have

thereby obtained his liberty he refused to divulge his friend's name. The unsuspecting victim was immediately marched to the tombs without being permitted to visit his office and leave word of his arrest. He was a stranger in the city and could not give bail. He lay in prison thirteen weeks awaiting trial, when, upon the unsupported testimony of Comstock and Britton, he was convicted. The jury, deeming him guiltless of intentional wrong, recommended him to the mercy of the court. His sentence was made the lowest prescribed by the law, to wit, three months' imprisonment and $100 fine. He was sent to the penitentiary, where his companions were the vilest characters known. His situation was deplorable. His attorney, B. F. Russell, who had known him ten years and that he was a person of good moral character, and had defended him without fee, visited Albany, and laid the case before the governor, who, feeling that a wrong had been done an innocent person, and that this was more a case of cruel persecution than of legal prosecution, sent his son down from Albany to investigate the case. The judge, the foreman of the grand jury, and the jury signed the petition for pardon, but Comstock did all in his power to prevent it, and brought out the voluminous credentials from his Society for the Suppression of Vice. But all his efforts were in vain. The governor upon learning all the facts in the case, and becoming convinced of the wrong that had been perpetrated, had the good sense and mercy to grant a full and unconditional pardon. Too much cannot be said in praise of the governor who took so noble a stand in defense of an injured individual, an oppressed citizen who was made to seemingly have committed a crime by a designing, unscrupulous, and relentless prosecutor. Blandin had not intended and did not intend to violate any law of virtue, honor, or morality.

Thus was Comstock rebuked. And, notwithstanding the stigma which has been thrown for life upon Blandin by being arrested for selling an obscene picture, we deem him a far better man than Comstock, and far less deserving of imprisonment.

The New York "World" for March 11, 1878, besides giving the details of Blandin's trial and conviction as above had these comments on the case.

"It is not a pretty story which appears in our columns today of an arrest just made by Mr. Comstock, with the help of an assistant who clearly seems to have seduced the offender into committing the offense for which he was arrested. There can be no baser or more mischievous crime in its way against society than this, and if the respectable members of the association by which Mr. Comstock is understood to be employed desire to preserve their own good name and the reputation of the work in which they are engaged, they will lose no time in clearing themselves of the very serious scandal brought upon both by such proceedings as those which were Saturday testified to before Judge Sutherland.

20. Case of Louis Wengenrath.—This man for several years kept a confectionery in the eastern part of Brooklyn, and was regarded as an honorable man, and entitled to the respect of all who knew him. His connections were good, and he moved in good society. Joseph A. Britton, the accomplice and tool of Anthony Comstock, for a long time had been in the habit of calling upon the confectioner, and making slight purchases of him. In February, 1878, this unprincipled man said to the confectioner that their mutual political friends, Gale and Ely, wished, for a certain purpose to get some fancy devices made in sugar, and Wengenrath was requested to furnish them. The reply was he had nothing of the kind on hand, and never had sold anything in that line. Britton importuned him from time to time to procure the fancy goods for him. At length as the names of his political friends had been given, the simple-hearted man bought the articles Britton was so anxious to procure, and handed him the same on one of his visits. He would not have taken the trouble to have procured the goods had not the names of Gale, etc., been given. The result was Wengenrath was soon arrested for violating what are known as the Comstock laws. He was tried in Brooklyn, and though the

accused proved an excellent character, and his friends did all they could for him, the laws are so severe that Judge Moore could not do less than impose the lowest prescribed penalty—three months' imprisonment and $150 fine.

Here is another instance of the despicable means which are employed by Comstock and his pliant tool to decoy and induce a good-hearted, unsuspecting person to commit an offense against a vile law he knows nothing about, and then to cause his arrest, trial, and imprisonment for an act he would never have thought of doing had he not been over-persuaded and urged to it by the most villainous intrigue and deception. The unfortunate victim of duplicity, intrigue, and villainy, who was honestly pursuing his honorable, legitimate business, is, at the present writing, in prison serving out the sentence imposed upon him, and Comstock enumerates this case among the desperate cases of obscenity and immorality that he has caused to be brought to justice. Let the reader decide whether Comstock or his victim is the most deserving of imprisonment.

21. Case of Edgar W. Jones.—For several years Mr. Jones has been doing a very active business in Ashland, Mass., supplying thousands of customers by mail with various publications, novelties, and curiosities, embracing prize-packages, "Handbook of Good Manners," "Bashfulness Cured," "How to Make Love," "Parlor Magic," "Tricks with Cards," "Dancing without a Master," "Letter-Writing Made Easy," "Handbook of Business," "Fortune-Teller and Dream Book," "Best Methods of Fishing," "The Art of Ventriloquism," "The Painter's Guide," "The Gem Microscope," etc., with several preparations for the hair, whiskers, etc. In this line of business Mr. Jones built up a trade almost marvelous for the times, filling from 75,000 to 100,000 orders per year. At the time of his arrest, in December, 1877, he had 1,100 reams of paper in his establishment—a four-story building—for his catalogues, circulars, etc., etc., and he gave employment to some sixteen persons in the place, whose duties consisted in folding and stitching catalogues, wrapping goods, filling

envelopes, etc., etc. He increased the post-office business of the town immensely. In the year 1877 he paid over $17,000 for postage stamps alone.

Four years ago he proposed to add to his line of goods Clark's "Marriage Guide," a work upon physiology, etc., and principally compiled from "Dunglison's Physiology." Wishing to proceed carefully, he took a copy to the district attorney of the U. S. District Court in Boston, for his inspection and opinion as to its being mailable. The official looked it over, and said he could not see why it was not perfectly proper to send through the mails, and looked upon it as the same as other medical works. "There is," said he, "but one person in the United States who will make you any trouble, and that is Anthony Comstock of New York. You had better send a copy of the work to him, and get his opinion upon the subject." Mr. Jones acted upon this advice, and sent a copy to Comstock, and wrote him asking for his views upon the subject; but he received no reply; he wrote again, but no reply was received, when he still wrote again with the same result. Then, acting upon the principle that "silence gives consent," he commenced selling the book, and for four years sold large numbers of them.

But it seems that Comstock had his evil eyes upon him all that time, and resolved, when the right time came, to pounce down upon him as a hawk would alight upon a chicken. At the time Comstock caused Jones' arrest, he pronounced his business fraudulent, and Clarke's work *obscene*. The matters complained of were laid before the grand jury, and, upon looking all his publications over, they could find nothing to condemn, save it might be a few features in Clarke's "Marriage Guide," which, to their minds, might possibly smack of obscenity. Upon this frail tenure they found a bill against Mr. Jones.

When he found he was indicted, Mr. Jones, of course, was obliged to procure bail and to look up counsel. He applied to Mr. Somerby, who is probably one of the finest lawyers in Boston, who said: "These obscenity cases are disagreeable

ones, especially in the United States courts. Were the case to be tried in our State courts there would be no trouble in the matter, but in the U. S. courts it is quite a different thing. You can hardly find a first-class lawyer who will defend a case of obscenity in the U. S. courts for a thousand dollars. The best way for you to settle the whole matter up easily is to plead guilty and ask for a light sentence. In that way your fine will be less, and you will get through with the unjust prosecution easier than any other way. It is an outrage on your rights, but the wisest way is to get out of the clutches of the man who has attacked you the best way you can."

Mr. Jones decided to act upon this advice, and when the time of trial came on, he entered a plea of "guilty." The judge, in a short address, used the following language:

"I think there is room to doubt whether this work, Dr. Clarke's 'Marriage Guide,' comes within the statute at all, unless every book on that subject is within the statute; but after the defendant's plea of guilty, perhaps it must be taken to be a book within the statute. It appears to have been sent to parties having a prurient curiosity, and perhaps his notions in doing this were not very elevated, but the book itself is not immoral or indecent at all, except that it treats of certain subjects supposed to be unknown, or not supposed to be known, and which, I think, ought to be taught in school. I don't see anything at all indecent in the book. I think the allegation in the indictment that the book contained passages which were too indecent to be spread upon the record was made to save the pleader, who wrote the indictment, some trouble, and not for the purpose of not shocking the morals of the court. If it was supposed to be offensive to the court, I am very much obliged to the pleader, but it was *not* so. I think, however, as the plea admits that it is an indecent book, it comes within the statute, but the book treats generally of medical subjects. Upon what examination I have been able to make, I couldn't see that it contains anything indecent. The Government does not claim that it contains anything

lascivious, but the book treats of certain things and diseases which are disagreeable, and which, perhaps, young persons should not know, or, as many may think, ought not to know. The defendant, I think, was engaged in a business not very elevating, although he said these books he intended never should be sent to young ladies' schools, yet, as the old or middle-aged people might have a desire to read them, he wished to run as near the line as he could, and, before issuing the book he communicated with the district attorney and Anthony Comstock. As he received no answer from Mr. Comstock, he took silence for assent, and sold the book. However, as he has pleaded that this is an indecent book, I shall sentence him to pay a fine of $150, without costs."

During the proceedings, Mr. Comstock was called to the stand, whereupon he condemned Mr. Jones' business in emphatic terms. Mr. Jones asked him to point out what there was in his business that was vile or immoral. In addition to Clarke's "Marriage Guide," Comstock thought the little book called "Widow's Traps" was a very indecent work and unfit for circulation. Mr. Jones' attorney turned to Mr. Jones and asked him if he had a copy with him. Mr. Jones answered that he had not. At this, Mr. Comstock was still more denunciatory and said the work was suppressed, and that he had seized the plates in New York, and that not a copy of the work was to be had. Jones, knowing that this was wholly untrue, whispered to one of his attendants to go to one of the book-stores in the city and procure a copy. In a few minutes the young man returned with a copy. At this Comstock was evidently taken aback and began to qualify his statements.

Mr. Somerby said: "Mr. Comstock, will you please take that little book and point out such parts as you deem obscene?" Comstock, in a stammering kind of way, said perhaps he was mistaken in the pamphlet, and that possibly there was nothing in it improper. "Did you not say, Mr. Comstock, that you had seized the plates of this book, and that no copies were to be had?" "I think I must have been

wrong: it must have been another work I had in my mind." "Do you now say, Mr. Comstock, since you see that a copy of the work has been easily procured, that it is obscene and unfit for circulation? and, if so, will you point out such parts and places?" "I do not now think the work is immoral or obscene." "Mr. Comstock, I consider that you have perjured yourself right here before the court." The court was evidently of the same opinion; and when Comstock intimated that the rulings of Judge Benedict of New York would be materially different from Judge Lowell's, and produced a long array of written or printed opinions of Benedict, Judge Lowell told him that he—Judge Lowell—was not governed by the rulings and decisions of Judge Benedict; that he acted upon the right of coming to his own decisions, the same as Judge Benedict undoubtedly did. Comstock was chagrined at his want of success in the Jones case, and the manner in which he was looked upon and treated was evidently a matter of intense disgust to him, and he could not help thinking that could he have brought the case before Judge Benedict, it would have terminated differently.

When Mr. Jones was arrested, Comstock went to the post-office in the village, and stopped all his registered letters and forbade the cashing of his money orders. He was receiving from fifty to seventy-five registered letters per day, and when the trial was over, eleven hundred had accumulated. These of course he wished to have the benefit of, as any penniless man would. He had to pay the fine imposed upon him. His business had been condemned by the court before which he was brought, and he, very naturally, wished to resume his regular avocation. To remove the embargo that had been placed upon his mail, he visited Washington, and had interviews with Postmaster-General D. M. Key, and A. A. Bissell, assistant attorney-general for the Postal Department, but he was chagrined to find that his visits there could do no good.

He was coolly informed there that Anthony Comstock had told them that he—Jones—was doing a fraudulent business, as well as sending out obscene matter, and they could not go

behind Mr. Comstock's information or instructions. Mr. Jones called attention to the fact that the grand jury found nothing wrong in anything he was doing except in Clarke's "Marriage Guide," and that Judge Lowell had decided that that was not improper, but ought to be in every family. "No matter," said Gen. Key, "Mr. Comstock tells us that you are doing an improper business, and we are bound to accept his statement." "But, General Key, is there no proof I can bring you that will convince you of Comstock's injustice to me? The selectmen of my town, every clergyman, every merchant, and nearly every citizen in the town and county who knows me, is willing to sign a certificate that I am doing a legitimate, honest business, and that I am a benefit to the town in which I reside. I have supplied some 250,000 persons with goods, and not one of them has complained of being defrauded, or that they have not in every case received the value of their money. What more must I do to cause you to decide that my mail ought to be delivered to me?" "All that is of no avail," said Gen. Key; "Mr. Comstock gives us his word that your business ought to be suppressed, and we believe his statement. He is an active agent in whom we have great confidence. True, he overreaches himself sometimes, but his mistakes are in favor of the department, and we must stand by him. He is a good Christian man, too, and we are bound to take his word in preference to anybody's else or to all others' combined," or words to that effect.

Gen. Bissell showed Mr. Jones about two yards of statement from Comstock in reference to Jones' business, but when the latter asked to read it, he was denied the privilege. When he desired that it might be read to him, he was again positively refused. When he asked to know what statements and charges it contained, that he might be able to rebut them, even this request was denied him, and Mr. Jones was strongly reminded of the old Spanish Inquisition, where a poor victim was arraigned without knowing who was his accuser or with what offense he was charged. There certainly is a similarity.

Mr. Jones returned to this city with a heavy heart, and, upon arriving in New York, proceeded to the office of the mighty Anthony Comstock, who not only rules the entire country, the U. S. Court. the N. Y. Postmaster and officials, publishers, druggists, but even the postmaster-general himself and his attorney.

He thus addressed himself to Mr. Comstock: "Mr. Comstock, you have injured me to the extent of at least $16,000. You have broken up my business. You have stopped my mail. You have taken away my goods and damaged me to a much greater extent than you can ever repair. You have very unnecessarily and very unjustly caused me not only a very heavy loss of property but a great amount of trouble! Now are you not satisfied? The Judge of the court before whom I was arraigned has pronounced my business legitimate, everybody who knows me will give me a good name, the hundreds of thousands of persons I have supplied with goods are satisfied with what they obtained of me, nobody has any complaint to make of me but yourself. Can you not let up your heavy hand and let me have my mail matter again and go on with my business, saying to the postmaster-general that you were mistaken as to the character of my business?" "No," said this modern Torquemada, "I have pronounced you a fraud, and I shall stick to it. You sell a class of goods that are of no benefit to those who purchase them, and you are a swindler. You shall not resume your business again, and if you attempt it I will come down upon you again." In reference to Judge Lowell, Comstock spoke contemptuously and averred that he, Comstock, had not had a fair show in Boston, and that if he had had the case before Judge Benedict in this city, he, Jones, would not have got off in the way he did.

Thus, the man who represents all the morality, all the virtue, all the decency, all the religion in the country, was as obdurate and as unimpressible as a stone. He had set out to crush Mr. Jones, and he was still determined to do it. Mr. Jones was compelled to return to his home and ruined business and to meditate upon the terrible rule of the one-man

power with which the country is cursed. The eleven hundred registered letters were returned to the writers, and all he could do was to regret that such a man as Comstock is able to sway such despotic rule in this boasted land of freedom.

Perhaps against no class of victims has Comstock shown more vindictive hatred than against Freethought and Reform publishers.

22. Case of E. H. Heywood.—This gentleman is the publisher of a paper called "The Word," at Princeton, Mass. He also publishes a few pamphlets, some upon finance, some upon interest, some upon social philosophy. He is a highly moral man, a gentleman of education and culture, a graduate of Brown University, and one who is highly esteemed by his numerous friends. His views upon marriage, divorce, and kindred subjects differ in many respects from those generally held, but he is entirely honest in his views, and he has the honesty to publish his advanced ideas fearlessly to the world. He has written a pamphlet upon the social question, called "Cupid's Yokes," of which he has sold twenty thousand copies. It is written ably and in unexceptionable language, but as it deals with subjects that are tabooed by orthodoxy, Mr. Comstock made up his mind that Mr. Heywood must be crushed out and sent to prison. He sent a decoy letter from Squan Village, N. J., under the assumed name of E. Edgewell, for a copy each of "Cupid's Yokes" and Trall's "Sexual Physiology," upon the receipt of which he coarsely arrested Mr. Heywood, while in attendance and presiding at a convention at Boston, and hurried him off without allowing him to communicate with his wife or brother who were in the same building.

Mr. Heywood succeeded in giving bail, and his trial before Judge Clark of the United States District Court came off January 17 and 18, 1878. The judge showed a great amount of prejudice against Mr. Heywood, and his rulings partook largely of the intolerance of a Christian bigot. He would not allow Mr. Heywood's witnesses to testify, and his charge was conspicuous for its unfairness and partiality, and

was considered by the first lawyers of Boston as a flagrant departure from judicial precedents and from the plainest principles of justice. The case was given to the jury on Friday, the 18th. They were out twenty hours, when the judge, wishing to return to his home in New Hampshire, dismissed the jury till Tuesday, the 22d. The verdict, when rendered, was *guilty*, but altogether a most singular one. The jury said they found him guilty on sending out "Cupid's Yokes," though they did not find the book obscene, within the meaning of the law. It is not strange that such a verdict should excite the risibilities of lawyers and others present. If the book was not obscene, it excited wonder on the part of many how a verdict of guilty could be found.

A motion was at once made by Mr. Heywood's attorney, Mr. Pickering, for a new hearing before two judges with a view of ultimately taking the case before the U. S. Supreme Court at Washington, that the constitutionality of the law may be tested. As, however, that court has recently decided adversely on a lottery case carried up from New York, holding the law to be constitutional, it seems hardly advisable to attempt to get the verdict relative to Mr. Heywood reversed. As these pages are being written, Mr. Heywood is expecting his sentence to be rendered at any time. It is to be hoped that justice and toleration may actuate the judge, and that American liberty may not be outraged by sending Mr. Heywood to prison for uttering his honest convictions and for committing no offense against the laws of morality, truth, or justice. If he is sent to prison for exercising the right of an American citizen it will only be another proof that we still have an Inquisition in this country which denies equal rights and privileges to believers and unbelievers in theological superstitions.

23. Case of D. M. Bennett.—On November 12, 1877, Anthony Comstock, attended by deputy U. S. marshall, Fritz Bernard, visited the office of "The Truth Seeker," and arrested the writer of these pages. In the next issue of his paper, November 17th, appeared the following:

IT HAS COME AT LAST.

One week ago was announced in these columns the arrest in Boston, by Anthony Comstock, of E. H. Heywood, of Princeton, Mass. I was not then aware that the time of my arrest was so near at hand; but at that very moment a warrant had been issued against me, and was only awaiting the pleasure of Mr. Comstock to serve it.

On Monday last, a little after the hour of twelve, while busily engaged in my office, preparing matter for this issue of the paper, that noted champion of Christianity, with a deputy United States marshal at his elbow, visited me with the information that he had a warrant for my arrest. I inquired by what authority and upon what charge? He replied by the authority of the United States and upon the charge of sending obscene and immoral matter through the mails. In reply to my inquiry as to what the objectionable matter was, he exhibited two tracts, one entitled "An Open Letter to Jesus Christ," and the other, "How do Marsupials Propagate their Kind?" He then demanded the amount of those tracts that were on hand, which were delivered to him. He showed a package of tracts, and so forth, which had been put up at this office and sent by mail to S. Bender, Squan Village, N. J., and a registered letter receipt for the money accompanying an order for "The Truth Seeker," tracts, and so forth, which was signed in this office. I asked him whether the party to whom the tracts were addressed was a *real* party, and he had opened his package, or a *bogus* party, and the letter ordering the tracts a mere decoy letter, such as he had used on other occasions. He acknowledged it was the latter, that he had written the order in an assumed name.

Being satisfied that Mr. Comstock was a special agent, empowered by the government of the United States to do the kind of work he is doing, I deemed any show of resistance useless, and passively accompanied him and the deputy marshal to the room of U. S. Commissioner Shields, in the U. S. Court-rooms in the new Post-Office building, who fixed my

bail at $1,500, and set Wednesday, the twenty-first, as the day for the preliminary examination. The matter of procuring bail was the next thing in order. Several persons were ready to obligate themselves for my appearance on the day set, but some one owning real estate in the city was required. This was soon procured and I was allowed to go about my business.

Thus I, hard upon sixty years of age, and who for nearly a half-century have been a supporter of our government, am now arrayed by it as an offender against it for sending indecent and blasphemous matter through the mails. The two tracts complained of were published two years ago. The "Open Letter" I wrote, and the other was written by Ex-Rev. A. B. Bradford, as pure and honorable a man as this country can produce, and it is of a purely scientific character, being originally written for the "Popular Science Monthy." Though the "Open Letter" may be thought pretty radical and outspoken, it is not obscene any more than the notion of a god begetting an offspring upon the person of a young Jewish maiden is obscene; and I consider that I had a perfectly legitimate right to ask the questions which I did upon the subject. The charge is ostensibly "obscenity," but the real offense is that I presume to utter sentiments and opinions in opposition to the views entertained by the Christian Church. Had I been a supporter of the Church and its dogmas, I should not have been disturbed by Comstock though I had sent matter through the mails twice as plain or "indecent"; and so I said to Comstock while on our way to the commissioner's. I asked him why it was, if he was so anxious to prohibit the circulation of obscene literature, that he did not indict the Bible Society. I told him that that book contained more obscenity than any other publication I knew of, and inquired of him where he could find more indecent narratives than the account of Abraham and his concubine, Lot and his daughters, Jacob and his wives and concubines, Judah and Tamar, David and Bathsheba and his other wives, the rape of Amnon upon his sister Tamar, the adultery

of Absolom and his father's concubine, of the extensive operations of Solomon with his seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines, and his amorous, lovesick song. He evaded these inquiries by remarking that some ladies near us might hear our remarks, thus virtually confessing that the persons and subjects named were indecent.

I have striven to be a law-abiding, upright citizen, doing injury to none who came within my reach; but I am now in the meshes of the law, held as a criminal, because I have vindicated the freedom of the press and have had the temerity to express my honest convictions. What the result of the trial will be is a question to be decided. Judging by the precedents, it will be likely to go hard with me. I am a prominent advocate of heterodox opinions, and have made myself obnoxious to the theological powers that be, and am considered a belligerent enemy to the system of Christianity. It is desired to remove me as far as possible from the field of action. John A. Lant, prosecuted at the instigation of Comstock, was fined $500 and sentenced to imprisonment at hard labor for eighteen months, and his offense was perhaps no greater than mine. Dr. E. B. Foote, another of Anthony's victims, for simply publishing useful scientific information, was fined $3,500, with costs amounting to $1,500 more. What, then, is there to be expected for D. M. Bennett?

This system of persecution may well be denominated the American Inquisition, and it will be truly lamentable if this great, free government, which was founded upon a non-Christian and anti-theological basis, is to become the head and front of a fearful tyranny. Anthony Comstock, the great informer in these mail cases, is an ardent Christian, and is backed by the Young Men's Christian Association and the God-in-the-Constitution party. He wields an immense power, arresting whom he pleases, and at his beck the United States marshals are prepared to run. The judge presiding over the United States District Court is a firm Christian, and no matter how objectionable or prejudiced he may be thought to be, there is no change of venue; and however severe the ver-

dict or sentence may be, there is no court of appeals to take the case to—no redress. Thus the reader can see at a glance how much like the Spanish Inquisition—before which unfortunate wretches, but two or three centuries ago, were arraigned for opinion's sake—our present system is. The Christian Comstock takes the place of the grand informer, the Christian judge becomes, possibly, the inquisitor-general, Christian jurors become aiders and abettors, and Christian fines and imprisonment take the place of the Cristian rack, wheel, and thumbscrew, beheading-block, and stake. Much progress has been made in the last three hundred years, but much more has yet to be made before a man can express his candid convictions without being in danger of summary arrest and of being deprived of his property and his liberty.

I protest that I have committed no crime. I trust I have wronged no person who walks upon the earth, and if there be supernal beings who float in the ether above the earth, I do not believe that I have wronged them. I have not intended to wrong the smallest child nor the greatest man that lives, and in a court of equal justice I do not fear to meet the consequences of my conduct.

I have not been fighting a personal warfare. I have battled for human rights, for mental liberty and the freedom of the press, and I trust the friends of liberty and equality will not forsake me in my hour of trial. At best, it costs a great deal of money to defend a case in the United States District Court. The best lawyers ask $1,000 to defend a case of "obscenity" before that court, and other expenses are correspondingly heavy. Justice is a very dear article, and then one is liable to be imposed upon in the quality. If a fine is imposed it has to be paid at once or imprisonment follows.

I rest my case with my friends and make no special appeal. I embarked in the Liberal publishing enterprise without capital, and I have held my own. I have no money with which to fee lawyers, to pay fines, nor to meet other heavy expenses. I am willing to spend my last breath in defense

of what I believe to be truth, justice, and righteousness, but I have not gold with which to back my feeble efforts to preserve my personal liberty, or to save my life.

I am the Liberal public's most obedient servant, D. M. B.

When the day arrived for the examination of the editor of "The Truth Seeker," Mr. Comstock seemed to be not quite ready to engage in the examination, and it was deferred for two weeks; and when that time had expired it was put off again. In the meantime "The Truth Seeker" teemed with ardent and sympathetic letters to the persecuted Infidel, and donations to a defense fund came in freely. The examination never came off. An influence was felt from Washington which is believed to have had some effect in this case. Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll wrote the postmaster-general David M. Key, and enclosed the two tracts upon which Mr. Bennett was arrested, and inquired of him if it was the purpose of the Government to prohibit such matter from being sent through the mail. He remarked, if they intended to prosecute cases of that kind that he should defend Bennett, not only in the U. S. Courts, but before the country as well. This letter, or something else, caused the authorities in Washington and in New York to not prosecute the case; and although the grand jury had found a bill against D. M. Bennett, his case was, on the fifth of January, 1878, fully dismissed. Thus, although Comstock had determined that the "old Infidel" should go to prison for the right he had exercised to think for himself and to express his honest convictions, the persecutor was completely foiled: but he still swore, with bated breath, that he would "get the old Infidel into prison," or words to that effect. His will was doubtless good enough, or rather *bad* enough, but for once, at least, his power proved deficient.

24. Case of Frank Rivers.—This gentleman is a book-seller and publisher in Boston. Not far from January 1, 1878, Comstock arrested him for selling, or sending through the mails, "The Fruits of Philosophy," written more than forty years ago by Dr. Charles Knowlton, and revised by

Charles Bradlaugh and Mrs. Annie Besant. It is the same work which the London Society for the Suppression of Vice, through its agent, Mr. Green, so bitterly prosecuted the latter two persons for selling, causing a sentence of fine and imprisonment to be rendered against them. Mr. Rivers' trial has not been held as these pages are being written, but it cannot well be doubted that Mr. Comstock will do all he can to cause Mr. Rivers to be fined and imprisoned.

Mr. Comstock has displayed an extra amount of zeal in the persecution and prosecution of a class of persons known as *preventionists* and *abortionists*, and has distinguished himself in that particular line. A few of his exploits in this direction will be given:

25. Case of Edward W. Baxter.—Mr. Baxter has been a resident of New York about eighteen years, and has been extensively engaged in the furniture trade, but, like many others, became embarassed and failed. Recently he engaged in putting up a remedy for leucorrhœa and other female weaknesses. It was a simple preparation of zinc, and is said to possess excellent qualities. It was advertised in the usual way by means of circulars, etc., and in them a caution is said to be inserted that special care should be taken not to use the remedy after certain exposure has taken place, as its use would almost certainly prevent conception. It is only proper to state in this connection that before embarking in the preparation and sale of the remedy, Mr. Baxter took able legal advice, and the business was pronounced legitimate and lawful; but here was food for Comstock. He ranks prevention of conception as among the greatest crimes in the calendar, and he enjoys no greater pleasure than sending persons to prison and pocketing the fines drawn from them for that crime of immense magnitude.

Comstock sent a decoy letter, obtained one of the circulars, ordered by registered letter some of the remedy, Baxter signed the registered letter receipt, and then he was in the power of the terrible informer, who arrested him at his residence, 993 Sixth avenue, on the evening of Monday, January

7, 1878. He was taken from his family and thrown into Ludlow Street Jail. On the following day he gave bail in the sum of $2,500 to await the action of the Grand Jury. His former partner, Luther P. Tucker, 684 Broadway, was also arrested and placed in the Tombs prison. Comstock got out a search warrant and went through his establishment and found, on an upper floor, goods, circulars, etc., belonging to Barker & Co., of which firm Baxter is the Co. A bill was found against Tucker by the Grand Jury.

In connection with this case an important subject is involved —the sinfulness of preventing conception. The procuring of abortions cannot be justified by any moral, right-minded person, but the too rapid increase of population and the expediency of preventing it by safe and legitimate means is a question which will demand the serious attention of future philosophers, physicians, and legislators. There are thousands of children brought into the world that it would be better for themselves and for the world if they never entered it. If conception, in these cases, had been prevented, no wrong would have been committed.

Mr. Baxter had his trial in the U. S. Circuit Court in May, 1878. His lawyer discovered a flaw in the indictment, and he deemed it best for Baxter to plead guilty and then take chances for the case to be thrown out of court. He acted accordingly, and Baxter pleaded guilty, and in a few days Judge Benedict showed an unusual degree of leniency and consideration by discharging the prisoner. His joy upon finding himself a free man once more may be appreciated when the fact is stated that when Baxter left the court house and stepped into the street he was fairly delirious, and knew not at first which way to go, but soon getting his bearings, he started off on a bee-line for his home, shouting out his thanks to Judge Benedict and for that flaw in the indictment.

It is indeed a joyful thing to escape the toils of Comstock, and it is not strange that such a piece of good fortune should make poor Baxter delirious with joy.

26. Case of Madam Restell. — Ann Lohman, usually

known as Madam Restell, who doubtless had for many years been a professional abortionist, was arrested by Comstock in February, 1878. He used in her case the same system of subterfuge, falsehood, and decoying arts that he uses with nearly all his victims. He called upon the Madam at her Fifth avenue mansion, and pretended that his wife or some other female feared she was in an interesting condition, and he wished to procure some medicine that would remove the difficulty. She sold him medicine of some kind calculated to remove obstructions. He visited her the second time to make some additional purchases, on which occasion he arrested her and took her to the Tombs, where she was placed under $5,000 bail, and not finding it easy to obtain, she was detained a prisoner.

It is believed that a prominent object which Comstock had in view in arresting this woman was to obtain some of the wealth which she possessed in abundance. The treasury of his "Society for the Suppression of Vice" had become exhausted. The donations of the previous year had not been as generous as in other years, and it began to be a matter of some solicitude with him as to where the money was to come from to admit of his drawing his annual salary of four thousand dollars. It was believed that if two or three indictments could be obtained against that wealthy woman, who had obtained her money in so questionable a manner, large sums could be drawn from her in the name of decency, morality, and religion.

The Madam was past sixty years of age; she had lived a quiet and unobtrusive life for more than thirty years, and the annoyances and anxieties of being prosecuted by Anthony Comstock upon the charge of aiding in procuring abortion preyed upon her mind excessively. As before remarked, no person who has not experienced the anxiety of mind and the feeling of disgrace attendant upon an arrest by Comstock, upon such charges as he prefers, can realize the utter wretchedness which such an arrest produces. There is nothing in the world like it for making one feel forsaken and booked for

a term of prison life. Madam Restell experienced this feeling to the full. She knew that, although her services had saved from disgrace many wealthy aristocratic families belonging to the most fashionable churches, public sentiment was aroused against her, and that the medical fraternity wished her removal from the lucrative position she occupied, and it was doubtless to subserve their interests in part that Comstock commenced his persecuting operations against her. She experienced much difficulty in obtaining acceptable bail. Many persons of wealth would have readily signed her bail bond could they have done so without the publicity that would necessarily attend it and the odium attached to being security for a person arrested upon such a charge. Her bail cost her not a little money, and one or more of the bondsmen procured at considerable expense surrendered her, and she was forced to look up other bail.

The anxieties and troubles connected with the situation, with the probable conviction, imprisonment, and heavy fine that would attend the approaching trial, preyed upon the unhappy woman's mind until she was driven nearly to insanity. On the first of April she was to appear before Judge Donahue, when an examination of her case would take place. She dreaded the day with a dread almost inconceivable, and early on the morning of that day, and while it was yet night, supposed to be about two o'clock A. M., she left her bed and repaired to her bath-room, when with a large carving-knife from the kitchen, and while reclining in the bath, she cut her throat from ear to ear, and there cold and dead she was found by her domestics in the morning. It was a shocking affair, but she had placed herself beyond Comstock's reach and rendered it impossible for him to clutch any of her money. It was doubtless a heavy disappointment to that Christian official.

According to the statement which Comstock himself made to a mutual friend, this was the fifteenth case where he had driven his victims to suicide, and to this number a larger list could probably be added of those who by his persecutions

and prosecutions, with the imprisonments and attendant disgrace and wretchedness, have been driven to an untimely grave, as effectually and with far greater mental suffering than if he had assassinated them with knife or pistol. What a reflection must it be to a man, with human feelings in his breast, that he has caused the death of more than thirty persons and the despoiling of his unfortunate victims of hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of dollars! But such is the power of Christian persecution—of the American Inquisition—at the present day.

After the sad taking off of Madam Restell the papers of the city and country were somewhat severe in their comments in reference to Comstock and his system of inveigling and decoying persons into his power to crush and destroy them. "The Daily Graphic" contained the following:

"Is it right to do evil that good may come? Is it a good thing for the community at large in putting down one form of vice to permit and encourage the development of another? Is not there danger in any method of ridding the world of one class of social parasites which develops another? . .

"Not only is "the suppressor gratified by finding his vice," but he carefully cultivates its growth. In order that he may get the credit which follows energy and success, he selects some person that he thinks has committed the crime which it is his duty to detect, a duty on which his bread and butter depends, and he goes to the person, and by all the inducements which human ingenuity can suggest he urges and beseeches him to commit the crime so that he can get the reward. . . . . .

"The man becomes the detective and informer, and ceases to be the public-spirited citizen.

"In the present case, if Mr. Comstock has been correctly reported, he did not originally take up the Restell matter because he thought it a public duty to do so. No one had complained of the woman for prosecuting her nefarious business, and it is current rumor that the pills and powders which she sold were a harmless sham, and that she herself was sim-

ply a fraud, whatever might have been the intention of herself or her patrons. Mr. Comstock was badgered into entrapping Restell. Men said to him: 'Yes, you are afraid of big game. You arrest the poor, but you permit one of the rich women of New York to prosecute her trade openly in this city.' With the woman or her trade no one can have any sympathy, and very few will regret her end. Mme. Restell is nothing, but the good of society is of the highest importance. The development of a class of spies and detectives whose fortune and fame would depend upon their success in entrapping the members of society into the commission of crime would threaten the very existence of society. The detective has a tremendous advantage over any private individual. He has the sympathies of society on his side. His methods are condoned so long as his motives are right, and his motives are taken for granted in nine cases out of ten. If, on the other hand, we look at the history of the detective service in this city we see how little deserving detectives have been of any credit. The whole detective service has been rotten, and there is hardly a question that if the truth were known detective and thief were synonymous in most cases.

"Let us not forget then that there are great dangers lurking in our present methods of suppressing immorality. We may produce a class of professional liars, informers, and decoys. And if we do, it will be pretty certain that we will not suppress vice, but suppress those who do not 'come down' to the informer. As yet we are safe, but the present system needs careful watching lest it should become the nursing mother of a class of rotten detectives."

After a full account of the Madam's funeral, the "Telegram" gave the following report of a conversation that took place at the Madam's house: Mr. Farrell, a son-in-law of the Madam, stated that she had at one time intended to flee to Canada; but she gave up this plan at the persuasion of her friends. He then went on to say: "Comstock's attempt to make her appear the vile person he represented her was an outrage, and his coming here with six officers expecting to

find a house full of patients must have been a great disappointment to him, as it only ended in the arrest of one old woman. There never has been a patient taken in this house, and all attempts to prove it would have failed."

The "Herald," in a report of a sermon by the Rev. Charles McCarthy, contained the following: "In my opinion, in the manner in which she was entrapped, she was more sinned against than sinning. The fraud and falsehood by which she was made amenable to a law that is universally violated by the medical profession of this city cannot be too strongly condemned. When, in the Great Assize, the question is asked, By what means was this misguided woman driven in her old age to self-slaughter? and the answer is given, She was hunted down by miserable subterfuge, by cunning and heartless fabrications, by open and mean lying, and by specious arguments which were craftily devised to work upon her better nature, what will the judge of all the earth say to this pretended suppression of vice and crime by means in themselves the most appropriate to promote vice and crime? This strange tragedy is calculated to call attention not only to the degrading methods by which crime is detected, but also to that condition of social degradation which fosters the crime, while in a few isolated cases it seeks to punish the criminal."

As great as the crimes of Madam Restell were, they were not to be compared to those against human rights and personal liberty committed by Anthony Comstock.

27. Case of Dr. Sara B. Chase.—"The Truth Seeker" for May 18, 1878, contained the following account of the arrest of that lady:

"*More Comstockism.*—On the ninth inst., Anthony Comstock, attended by his accomplice and partner, Joseph A. Britton, and officer James G. Howe, visited the house of Dr. Sara B. Chase, No. 56 West Thirty-third street, and arrested that lady and took her before Judge Morgan at the Tombs, where she was held in $1,500 bail upon the enormous charge of having sold two female syringes, gotten up expressly for cleansing and healthful purposes.

"Dr. Sara B. Chase has resided in this city nearly four years, and has become well known as a lecturer on physiological subjects before separate classes of ladies and gentlemen, and also as a successful practitioner in homeopathic medicine. She has recently started 'The Physiologist,' an excellent reform and health monthly, of which she is editor and publisher.

"She has given several courses of lectures in Brooklyn, and that is the home of Anthony Comstock. It seems that not long since he opened a correspondence with the lady, upon the subject of procuring a syringe from her. He did not write in his own name, but followed, rather, the course for which he has become notorious, of writing over a fictitious name. He this time personated a Mrs. Farnsworth, who had attended Mrs. Chase's lectures and had received valuable information thereby, and wished to procure a syringe from her, but on account of illness was unable to be present on the occasion of the doctor's last lecture in Brooklyn, and she would send her husband to the doctor's residence for one of the instruments. In fact, Comstock himself took this letter to the lady, and passed himself off as the veritable Mr. Farnsworth whose wife wanted a syringe. He received the instrument, with full directions as to how it should be used. He was so well pleased with it that, on the following day, he took his bosom friend, Joseph A. Britton, to see the doctor and procure one of those valuable instruments for his wife.

"Dr. Chase being, of course, willing to sell these valuable syringes to every married lady who wished them, cheerfully sold one to the honorable Mr. Britton; and then it was that the pure and spotless Mr. Anthony Comstock made himself known, telling the lady that he was himself no less than Anthony Comstock, and that she must accompany him to the Tombs. Before leaving the premises, however, he caused the house to be searched and overhauled in a most shameless manner. He caused the ladies of the family to be shut up in a room, and then every room, closet, drawer, and every conceivable place was examined, even to bundles of letters and

correspondence. He continued the search until, in the pocket of one of the lady's dresses, hanging in a closet, he found the decoy letter he had written in the name of Mrs. Farnsworth, which he carefully took with him, that the proofs of his lying and villainy might not easily be produced against him.

"As an instance of Comstock's meanness, it may be stated that among the lady's private papers he found an article on 'Fœticide,' which was decidedly against the practice of it; but, in order to present her case as unfavorably as possible, in the statement which he furnished 'The Tribune,' he mentioned finding the article, but changed the title to 'Fœticide — *When it should be done.*' There were no grounds for his making that change; and a man who would do such a deed would probably commit forgery or theft.

"In the same 'Tribune' article, Comstock exhibited more of the ignoble traits of his character by attempting to prejudge the case in the public mind by placing the lady at a disadvantage by styling her a rival of Madam Restell, and making ungentlemanly and uncalled-for remarks about her mouth. On the way to the Tombs, Comstock spoke to the lady about her paper, 'The Physiologist,' and said he regarded it as an immoral paper and one that ought not to be allowed circulation. She found no trouble in giving bail, and thus the Christian Comstock was cheated out of the pleasure of causing her to be kept in the Tombs over night.

"The crime which the agent of the Society for the Suppression of Vice charges against Mrs. Chase, is that by the syringes which she recommends and sells, she places it in the power of wives to prevent conception. This he holds to be very criminal in any one whom he chooses to make his victim, but when the president of his society, Mr. Samuel Colgate, wishes to engage in the business of selling an article which he recommends as a preventive of conception, he does not interfere in the enterprise and does not try to bring his friend Colgate to justice, and in this laudable clemency he is seconded by the amiable United States district-attorney, Mr Stewart L. Woodford, who knows how Mr. Colgate has vio-

lated the law, but, himself being an honored member of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, refuses to prosecute its honored but intolerant president. It is of course very criminal in Dr. Chase to take any means to provide persons with the means for preventing conception, but Mr. Colgate may sell tons of vaseline, which, blended with salicylic acid, he recommends as being potent in preventing conception or removing the effects of it, and he shall not be disturbed. He is a pious man, he supports the Church, he loves Jesus and hates Freethinkers—and he is at liberty to sell all the vaseline he wishes. No laws nor courts nor Comstocks shall be sufficient to interfere with him in his lucrative career. Being a "truly good man," he is to be allowed uninterruptedly the privileges which belong only to the faithful. He may do as he pleases sitting under his own vine and fig-tree, and none shall make him afraid.

"This question of preventing conception is one which is bound to be discussed and passed upon by the American public as it has been by the people of Great Britain. It will be canvassed in all its aspects, and it will be examined into with a view to decide whether it is criminal or not. To all intents and purposes this is an open question, and must remain so for some time to come. Anthony Comstock, seconded by the members of Congress and of our State Legislature, has attempted to close it, and to pronounce prevention as criminal, but it is very doubtful if his dictum will stand through all coming time. It is at all events our privilege and our pleasure to examine the subject carefully.

"There are cases where the prevention of conception is not only harmless but entirely proper. Suppose a mother has ten children already, with one at the breast, is it absolutely sinful to take harmless measures that the number be not increased? Suppose a pair in great poverty with a house full of children half-clad and half-fed, the anxious parents driven to the greatest straits to be able to supply even this half-allowance, ought they to be sent to the penitentiary for using prudential means to stop the increase of their half-fed and

half-clothed offspring? If one or both parents have the seeds of consumption in them, if three of their children have already fallen victims to pulmonary diseases, and two others are hastening on in the same road, is it wrong for them to use laudable means to prevent still others being added to this woeful number? If the father is eaten up with syphilis, or is semi-rotten with scrofula, is it sinful for the mother by a cleansing process to use such a simple preventive as will not increase the number of children to be miserable heirs to disease and wretchedness? If the father has by a long course of dissipation brought upon himself imbecility or semi-idiocy, shall the mother not be allowed to prevent an unsound mental and physical offspring to be born to such a father? If the tendency to insanity is strong in the husband's family, if his father and grandfather became hopelessly insane, and in a fit of madness butchered their wives and children, is it positively criminal for the mother to use an ablution of water applied by the use of a female syringe to prevent the miserable, dangerous stock from being perpetuated? If a mother by toil and child-bearing is broken down in health and strength until she is hardly able to drag herself around, and if in her last confinement she suffered to the extent that her life was despaired of, and her nearest friends believed she could not survive, and could not possibly pass through another such ordeal, would she be committing a crime against God or man by using a simple means of prevention? Are there not thousands upon thousands of similar cases where prevention is not in the slightest sense wrong, but in the highest degree commendable and proper? and shall Anthony Comstock and his legal abettors send people to prison for aiding this thing? In fact, is it not right for any wife or mother to decide for herself whether she wishes to bear more children or not? Take China, for instance, where parts of that country are excessively overcrowded, where hundreds of thousands are starving to death for the want of food, and where dead children are offered in the market as food, is it criminal to prevent by sensible means the birth of more children under such circum-

stances? Is it not better, far better, that conception be prevented than that children be born into the world to die of starvation or to be eaten up by the vilest diseases?

"In any case of prevention that may be used, even admitting that it is a crime, it is most difficult to know whether the crime has absolutely been committed, for it is impossible to be told whether conception would have taken place or not. The proportion of conceptions to the possibilities is extremely small. It is probable the proportion is much the same as with the seeds of trees of the forest, the herbs of the field, or the ova of the fishes of the sea—perhaps not one in a thousand produces its like. We have seen no estimate by physiologists as to what the proportion is, but probably it is not more than one to fifty or to one hundred; hence it must be seen that if the most effectual preventive is employed that can be devised, it must be highly improbable that a crime has been committed. The most effectual preventive known in the world (and we hope Comstock will not cause our arrest for making it known) is for the sexes to *strictly remain apart;* and of course, then, this is the most criminal of all the modes, and persons guilty of it should be sent to prison for not less than ninety-nine years.

"This question has attracted the earnest attention of some of the best men and the deepest thinkers in England, and the subject is bound to arouse attention in our own country. There are some persons depraved enough to think it would be better to place some check upon the too great evils of over-population, rather than too see the distress repeated here that exists in China, in India, and in some of the over-crowded cities of Europe. Those persons do not regard with favor the introduction of miserable children into this world, whose parents are only fitted to bring a helpless or diseased offspring into existence, and, with Darwin, they think that in the propagation of no domestic animals are men so careless as with their own race. In discussing this important subject Darwin says: "Excepting in the case of man himself hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed."

The class of intelligent persons referred to do not regard the sexual part of the human organization as being wholly vile, all knowledge of which is positively criminal and must needs be suppressed. On the other hand, they hold that the organs which constitute us men and women are as honorable, and should be as well understood, as any other parts of our bodies, and that it is not criminal to understand their uses and proper needs. It is only Anthony Comstock and such prurient minds as his that see so much that is vile and criminal in the distinguishing features that make us men and women. It is such as he who think that people ought to be sent to prison for even looking at the picture of a nude human being; and it remains to be tested whether Comstock shall be the permanent law-maker and dictator in our miscalled free country.

"The subject, as observed, of population and over-population is of vital importance to the human race, present and future: it cannot be ignored, and should not be. This subject must come to the front; it must be examined; it must for some time in the future remain an open question; and we decidedly hold that neither Anthony Comstock nor his pet members of Congress and of the Legislature have any right to close it.

"The most villainous of Comstock's tricks in this business is the effort to represent Mrs. Chase as an abortionist, when nothing is further from the truth. No person feels more against that crime or has spoken more strongly against it than has the lady herself. Comstock will not be able to prove anything of that kind against her, and it is only by his despicable course in putting false headings to his 'Tribune' articles that he can accomplish his vile purposes. It is not enough to bring odium upon the lady by causing her arrest, but he seems determined to prejudice her case all he can in the public mind before it comes to trial. If such a man can be a good man, where, pray, are the evil ones to be found?

"Is it, indeed, so great a crime to sell a female syringe that people must have their business broken up, their reputation

blasted for it for life? If it is a crime for Dr. Chase to sell a syringe of this kind, every druggist in the country ought to be sent to prison for life. There is probably not a druggist in the United States who has not sold female syringes. We were in the drug business a quarter of a century, and we sold many scores of them, and did not dream that we were committing a crime by doing so. From what we know of the importance of cleanliness in maintaining the health of both sexes, we are fully convinced that these syringes should be used much more than they are. We are decidedly of the opinion that no lady's toilet is complete who has not one of them. Those who lack them are not in possession of a necessary aid to cleanliness and health. A person who supplies ladies with them is really doing a good deed to his fellow-beings. In preventing their diffusion and making it a crime, Anthony Comstock is again proving himself an enemy to his race."

It is a cause of pleasure that when Comstock presented the case of Dr. Chase before the grand jury, they failed to see that the lady had committed any offense for which she ought to be punished or that she had violated any law of the land. One of the grand jury asked Comstock if it was his intention to drive Dr. Chase to suicide as he had driven Madam Restell. The agent for the Y. M. C. A. and for the Society for the Suppression of Vice evidently felt chagrined at his want of success in this case, and the congratulations extended towards Dr. Chase were hearty and numerous. Many of the papers condemned Comstock's course. An indignation meeting was held in Science Hall, Saturday evening, May 25th, in which Dr. Chase gave the opening address, and was followed by G. L. Henderson and J. D. McClelland, attorney. The latter, being thoroughly acquainted with Comstock's manner of doing business, was able to speak to the point. He gave several facts within his own knowledge connected with the Comstock cases he had defended. One case in particular is worthy of attention. It was of a man whom Comstock had arrested for sending—in answer to a decoy letter from Com-

stock—a syringe through the mail. The unfortunate man was thrown into prison, and his wife and children left to suffer. On the trial, despite the hard swearing of Comstock, and the severe rulings of Judge Benedict, he succeeded in causing the jury to stand six and six. He proved, by several eminent physicians of the city, that the syringe was a valuable one and innocent of any harm. This amounted to nothing with Judge Benedict. The speaker pronounced the rulings of Judge Benedict—from whose court there was then no appeal—as being of a very severe character. He expressed his joy that the law was now changed, so that there is a chance for a case to be opened and appealed; and, if justice demands it, a new hearing can be had.

After the jury had thus disagreed, a new trial was obtained, and the second time he succeeded in dividing the jury six to six. Even for the third time this result was produced: but on the fourth trial the rulings of the judge were so severe upon the prisoner that a verdict was secured, and the unfortunate prisoner was declared guilty, and he was sentenced to two years' imprisonment for the trivial offense of sending a syringe through the mail.

When the husband had thus been sent to prison, the young wife saw very hard times. She could get work but a portion of the time, and to keep herself and children from starvation she was compelled to pawn one article of jewelry after another, and one keepsake after another, and by this course alone was she able to keep herself and children alive; but at length everything of any value that could be pawned was put in pledge, and there was nothing but utter want to stare her in the face. A few months after this the attorney one morning saw this woman arraigned as a lawless prostitute before the police court. He sought an opportunity to speak to the wretched woman, and he asked her how in the world she had come down to occupy that position. With tears in her eyes she told him she had struggled to obtain bread for her children as long as she possibly could, and when everything was gone, and she was upon the point of starvation, she had

yielded to the importunities of her landlord, and had prostituted her body to save the lives of her children, and that she had since gone down step by step till she was where she was. "Ah!" said the attorney, "if there is a God, if there is a future world of retributive justice, if there is a place of torment, that man, Anthony Comstock, will there have to answer for the human wreck and suffering he has produced!"

He further stated that the cases of conviction that Comstock proudly boasted of had cost the hottest tears of anguish and the keenest pangs of sorrow known to the human heart, and that the same had been accomplished by the vilest arts of the informer, the basest falsehood, the most despicable tricks of the decoyer, as well as by treachery of the blackest kind. "More than that," he asserted, "Comstock and his accomplice have been guilty of perjury in prosecuting the hapless victims whom they have thrust into prison." He believed Anthony Comstock to be one of the worst men he ever knew —one who was utterly lost to every feeling of pity and compassion. The manner in which he pictured the heartless villain stood out in bold relief before the vision of the audience present.

As these pages are being written, Dr. Chase is about commencing a suit for damages against Comstock for false imprisonment and for injuries she has sustained in her business. At the time of her arrest her house was full of paying tenants, her lectures were well attended, and she had a remunerative practice, but the odium connected with an arrest by Comstock, and upon such a charge is sufficient to drive away large numbers of timid people who are afraid to have the least connection with a suspected person. Her business has suffered excessively, and it is to be hoped she may be able to recover suitable damages. And it would seem but simple justice that the society which employs him and pays him $4,000 per year for the contemptible services he renders should be made to pay for the needless wretchedness, misery, and loss of property they cause. If a man or a company keep a vicious dog which attacks and tears people to pieces,

they ought to be responsible for his conduct. It is to be hoped Dr. Chase may be successful in her suit.

Too much space is perhaps being occupied with this character, far more than is due him, but it is desirable to make a fair exhibit of the kind of work he is doing in the name of decency, morality, and the Christian religion. As the recognized agent and executor of the very Christian Society for the Suppression of Vice and the Y. M. C. A., and as a striking type of the latest form of Christian persecutions, it is but proper that a due amount of space in this work be accorded him. Less than thirty of his cases have here been given, being not one-tenth of the whole number of which he boasts. Had the nearly three hundred arrests he has made been given in detail, with all the anxiety, trouble, personal inconvenience and wretchedness they have caused, they would doubtless fill a volume as large as this. Probably enough has been given to enable the reader to obtain a pretty clear view of the character of the man. But lest all his Christian qualities may not be appreciated, one or two additional instances of his devotion to decency and high orthodox morals are given.

In the issue of the "Waverly Magazine" for November 10, 1877, appeared an advertisement reading like this: "To Sports.—An elegant book for you will be sent on receipt of fifty cents. Address J. G. Phillips, Box 49, Squan Village, N. J." This was pointed out to the writer as being the work of Comstock, and that it was he who was doing that advertising. It was known at once that it was one of his post-offices, that he had a home in that vicinity, and that he had sent to the writer at least two letters from that point under the name of S. Bender (probably the father of Miss Ella), ordering "The Truth Seeker," the "Open Letter to Jesus Christ," the "Marsupial" tract, and several others, as well as a copy of Dr. Trall's "Sexual Physiology." It was from Squan Village, under the same name, that he ordered goods from E. W. Jones, and it was from Squan Village that he wrote to E. H. Heywood for "Cupid's Yokes" and another copy of Trall's "Physiology." It was from Squan Village

that the interesting letters came forth to the impressible Dr. Morrison.

It was easy to reach the conclusion that J. G. Phillips, S. Bender, Miss Ella Bender, and Anthony Comstock were one and the same person. A friend ordered a copy of Anthony's "Book for Sports," inclosing fifty cents in a letter which he had registered. In due time the receipt came back signed "J. G. Phillips," and after a few days came a copy of a cheap London edition of the New Testament, which in England retails at twopence, and of which hundreds of thousands are given away. In quantities they probably cost two cents. On a corner of the wrapper was a small gum label, reading, "From the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York," which place, by the by, is where Comstock has his headquarters. Here the connection between J. G. Phillips of Squan Village and Anthony Comstock of 150 Nassau street was thoroughly established. But it was thought his profits were too large. For the fifty cents a book had been received which cost at the most three cents, postage two cents. Fifty cents for what cost five is a thousand per cent, which in hard times is a very large profit. In a few days, however, came back the fifty cents in a registered letter, with a pious homily which bore no signature; but it could have been from none else than the Squan Village firm.

At this stage of the business the party ordering thought he was a Testament ahead. He had received a copy of that esteemed book, a pious letter, and his money back again—a very good investment. It could not easily be seen where Comstock could make much by doing business in that way, for he had used seventeen cents in postage stamps besides the stationery. His game was better understood a few days later when there came from the same source in a sealed envelope with six cents in stamps upon it, some fifteen or twenty pages from a most villainously, obscene book entitled, "Pleasing Memoirs," with an indecent, obscene picture of the most objectionable character. The envelope was directed in a disguised hand.

That all this was the work of the Christian Comstock there cannot be the slightest doubt. An intelligent person went to Squan Village to interview the postmaster and others, and he learned that J. G. Phillips, S. Bender, and Anthony Comstock are the same person, and that the postmaster there was privy to the artful games Comstock had been playing. The name and address given by the person who ordered the "Book for Sports" to J. G. Phillips were never given to any other person, so all that came to that address must have come from the party who had the name and address. It could not have been otherwise. It was Comstock and nobody else that mailed that vile stuff. He was the only one who had the address referred to, and he was the only one who had that kind of literature, having monopolized all there is in the country. In the whole transaction it is easy to trace his low cunning and his diabolic desire to catch some unsuspecting, unsophisticated person in his snares. Let others decide whether such a man is fit to control the morals of the country, and to be entrusted with unlimited power to persecute, to imprison, and to take the property and life of those far better than himself.

The latest instance of Comstock's Christian morality and purity is as follows: On the night of June 14, 1878, Anthony Comstock, attended by five other men, supposed to be brother members of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, went to a house of prostitution, 224 Greene street, and those six godly men induced three frail women, who make their bread by the prostitution of their bodies, for the consideration of fourteen dollars, to lay off all their wearing apparel, and, in a closed room, to expose their persons, like so many original Eves, to the six men aforesaid. After these young Christian Associates had feasted their eyes to the full, and even Comstock had become satisfied, he then assumed his dignity of office and said they were his prisoners, and that he was Anthony Comstock. He drew a revolver, and pointing it at the woman who kept the house, declared, in the most imperious manner, that if she stirred he would blow her brains out. He ordered

them to wrap blankets around them and to march off to prison just as they were, but he finally relented enough to let them put their garments on, and they, with the landlady, were marched to the fourteenth ward station and kept in prison several days, when they succeeded, at an expense of three hundred dollars each, in obtaining bail. In the excitement of the occasion the landlady lost a seventy-five-dollar diamond ring from her finger, but she was hurried out of the room before she could have time to find it. It is thought that one of the six good men were enriched by finding that valuable piece of jewelry, as the landlady has not seen it since. Is it to be supposed that the Young Men's Christian Association and the Society for the Suppression of Vice will be proud of this last moral act of their agent and representative? Was ever a baser, lower, and more contemptible act ever committed by a man? Can any state of things justify such a dirty, indecent piece of business? Were not the poor unfortunates, who are reduced to such pitiful expedients to earn their daily bread, quite as honorable as Comstock?

Comstock has frequently asserted, in the public press and in private conversation, that he makes no arrests and enters upon no case until he has received authority to do so from his society, or the committee of the society, having such business in charge. If that is so, his Society for the Suppression of Vice must be held responsible for this filthy piece of business in that house of prostitution. That Christian society is either *particeps criminis* in the disgusting affair or their secretary and agent has lied. At all events, they cannot evade the official acts of their agent and representative.

Almost every man in the world, whether good or bad, may be said to have had in the past his archetype, prototype, or precursor, from whom he has patterned or from whom he has seemed to take qualities and characteristics to govern his own conduct. In looking for such an antitype for Anthony Comstock among the violent and cruel persecutors which the Christian Church has raised up, the mind almost intuitively reverts to Torquemada, the demoniac inquisitor-gen-

eral of Spain, for a sketch of whose career the reader is referred to page 508. It may well be conceded that Comstock would have made a very vigilant inquisitor-general, and that he would have delighted in arresting, toruring, and burning hereties and every person who presumed to differ from the standard of thought and opinion to which he pays allegiance. Though Torquemada caused the death of one hundred thousand innocent persons, and subjected a greater number to cruel torture and imprisonment, he was too pure a man, too honest and sincere, to stand as a fit type for Anthony Comstock, for he did not follow his infernal system of persecution for the purpose of making money by the sufferings of his victims as Comstock has done. A farther search must be made for a prototype. O, here is one, it is Matthew Hopkins, the notorious witchfinder of the seventeenth century, some account of whom may be found on page 796. There are some striking points of resemblance between the two men. Hopkins was a witchfinder-general in the seventeenth century as Comstock is obscenity-finder-general in the nineteenth century. Hopkins was clothed with a species of legal authority to prowl over several of the shires of England, seizing his victims wherever he could find them, and Comstock has been clothed with a similar sort of legal authority to prowl over some of these American States, hunting down his unfortunate victims in the same kind of way. It was the pleasure of Hopkins to seize upon those he or others declared to be witches and to put them through the most fiendish tests and to bring them to torture and death. Comstock eagerly siezes upon his victims, whom he accuses of obscenity or immorality or heterodoxy with equal venom, hate, and cruelty, considering the age of the world in which he lives, and from this view he has probably caused an equal number of deaths. It has been observed that Comstock has boasted of causing fifteen persons to commit suicide, and it is probable that others who have been forced to an involuntary death by means of his heartless persecutions are not fewer in number; and those whose hearts he has torn with

anguish and deep grief, as with hooks of steel, are to be numbered by scores and hundreds. Matthew Hopkins never gloated over his victims more with the hate of a demon than Comstock has gloated over his. Both prosecuted their diabolical business in the name of decency and morality, and both were arrant hypocrites.

It will be remembered that Hopkins pursued his operations in this manner: When an unfortunate woman was complained of to him as a witch, or of whom it was even suspected that she was a witch, he at once shut her in a room, stripped her naked, and placed her in a very painful position, which, if she did not retain, he bound her with strong cords, and kept her thus without food, drink, or sleep for twenty-four hours. When exhausted nature yielded to the demand for sleep he roused her and made her walk till her feet were blistered; and when, by this Christian treatment, he had reduced his victim to a state of insanity or imbecility, he made her confess to having had intercourse with the devil, and with having given birth to imps in the forms of lizards, toads, snakes, and goats, whose father was the devil; and then, upon that enforced confession, he caused her to be tortured and to be put to death in the most shocking manner.

Comstock has exhibited similar traits of character. He is equally merciless and equally callous to every sentiment of human kindness. The victims of Hopkins were largely females, while those of Comstock are divided between the sexes, and those he has succeeded in making sufficiently wretched for any purpose. Every man whose arrest he has caused had a wife, a mother, or a sister to be rendered heart-broken by the deep disgrace cast upon them and the great wrong thus inflicted.

A favorite way, it will be remembered, that Hopkins had for testing his unfortunate victims was by "the swimming process." The miserable wretch was tied up in a sheet and thrown upon the surface of a pond or river. If she sunk and was drowned she was supposed to be innocent, but she was drowned, nevertheless; but if she floated, as about nine in ten

did, then she was declared a witch, and was either dragged through ponds and ditches until life was extinct, or she was hanged or burned, as the decision might be.

But finally the people became so incensed at Hopkins' cruelty that they concluded to try his own test upon him. They tied him in a sheet and threw him upon the water, and he floated; hence he was declared a witch or wizard, and he was accordingly executed upon the spot. If the analogy is carried out in Comstock's case, there are many who, having a most bitter recollection in connection with him, will not be sorry. It is believed by many that his days of usefulness are over, and that he ought to be allowed to depart in peace.

In one respect Hopkins was far superior to Comstock; Hopkins was not guilty of the meanness of decoying and entrapping his victims by duplicity, intrigue, and lies, that he might have the pleasure of torturing them. He waited for others to enter a complaint, and did not sneak around as a spy, and lie in wait for those whom he wished to subject to his power. It would be well were Anthony Comstock as honorable a man as was Matthew Hopkins.

A few additional quotations from the press, bearing upon Comstock's manner of conducting his business, may not be inappropriate here. The Philadelphia "Record" spoke as follows:

"Mr. Comstock has been trying to trap unwary sinners by forging letters and buying forbidden wares. It strikes us as bad policy to use as instruments for reforming offenders men who are meaner than the offenders themselves. People judge a cause by the character of its advocates, and principles by their exponents; and the cause of morality must suffer seriously when such men as Comstock publicly espouse it and become known as its ministers. He is meaner by a few degrees than the agents of our Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and this is saying much against Comstock, but we have his own confession in proof of our assertion. He is a self-convicted sneak and hypocrite, without

moral honor, and must naturally do the cause of morality far more harm than good."

Bonner's "New York Ledger" in connection with the arrest of Dr. Sara B. Chase, said:

"*Is Deception Justifiable?*—Our sympathies are with Anthony Comstock, or any one else, in every proper effort which can be made to punish the parties who deal in prohibited articles; but if the following extract from a report in the 'Tribune' be true, we think Mr. Comstock acted in, to say the least, a very questionable manner in the instance referred to:

"The 'Tribune' states that on Tuesday Mr. Comstock went to the house of Mrs. Chase, ostensibly to buy an article she was forbidden by law to sell—having previously bought one of the same kind. *He told her he wanted to make the purchase for a friend.* 'Her face,' continues the report, 'lighted up at once, and she turned about promptly and led the way to her office'—where she was arrested.

"Is there any necessity for practicing such deceit, in order to arrest a person engaged in a nefarious business? We think not. At any rate, we should think an honorable, high-toned man would find it difficult to reconcile with his own feelings of self-respect the resorting to such measures, even on account of their supposed necessity in the abatement of a great evil."

Oliver Johnson's "Orange Journal" (N. J.) contained the following:

"Mr. Anthony Comstock is entitled to the thanks of every lover of social purity for his efforts to suppress the traffic in obscene literature and to expose the murderers of unborn children. In this work the more skillful his devices, the heavier his hand, the better. But he should have a care lest his persecutions of the guilty degenerate into persecutions of the innocent. There are honest differences of opinion among men upon some very important and delicate physiological questions, and it is not for Mr. Comstock to make himself a *doctrinaire*, to suppress by violence the right of speech and of

printing upon such subjects. He must remember that it is possible for very good people to hold opinions contrary to his own, and contrary even to those generally held in the community, upon physiological subjects: and if he would retain the good will of the community he should learn how to discriminate between the agents and abettors of impurity, and well-meaning people, however mistaken, who are laboring, according to their best light, to promote the public welfare."

Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll expressed his opinion of Comstock in these words, "I regard Comstock as infamous beyond expression. I have very little respect for those men who endeavor to put down vice by lying: and very little respect for a society that would keep in its employ such a leprous agent."

It is greatly to be regretted that in the last quarter of the nineteenth century such a base specimen of humanity as Anthony Comstock has been selected to be the protector of public morals, to be a champion of the Church, and a censor of the mails, of medical and physiological literature, and of Radical and Freethought publications. If free America is to have a censor of the press and of her mails, it would certainly be desired that a man might be selected to discharge the duties of the office who possessed some qualifications for the position, and who exhibited, at least, an average amount of morality, decency, honesty, and truthfulness. Can members of the Christian society which for years has employed this man and made him their active agent and representative, expect to add to their own credit or to that of the Christian religion by employing and sustaining such a despicable character as Anthony Comstock—the Matthew Hopkins of the nineteenth century?

RECAPITULATION.

For the convenience of the reader a brief summary of the most conspicuous acts of the characters treated in the foregoing pages will here be given. As the first few characters are regarded, more or less, as myths, therefore there is not any very marked conduct to be mentioned in connection with them. First:

Jesus. His miracles. His deity. His moral teachings. He did not respect the rights of property. As a communist. He taught submission to wrong. His professions to pardon sin. He exhibited an imperfect sense of justice.

Jesus and Jesuism. The progress of Jesuism.

Peter and the great compromise.

The Four Evangelists. Evidence that all the gospels had one origin. The writers do not claim to be eye-witnesses. What was the character of the early Christians? Christianity always intolerant. Christian admissions against the Scriptures.

Paulism versus Jesuism. The early Christian Church.

Paul was disagreeably self-conceited and boastful. In his great desire to get followers, he became a hypocrite, was all things too all men; and he justified dissembling and lying if they contributed to the glory of God. His notions concerning women have caused much of the oppressive tyranny under which the female sex in all Christian countries have suffered during the last eighteen centuries.

Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Polycarp, Papias, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen, early Fathers of the Church, are chiefly famous for the writings attributed to them. The Catholic Church is founded more upon their writings than upon the Bible; but modern research is fast

proving that their writings are nothing more than a record of the legends and traditions floating about during the early years of the Christian Church, mixed with a due proportion of pagan "mysteries," changed to suit the purposes of the new religion.

St. Victor was one of the first bishops of Rome, and began the movement which ultimately placed the bishops of Rome at the head of the Christian Church.

St. Anthony is famous chiefly on account of his laziness and filthiness, wearing nothing but a sheepskin, which he never changed, and never washed his body.

St. Paul the Hermit was the founder of the Christian system of monkery. He was a fanatic who lived more like a beast than a human being.

Stephen I., bishop of Rome, was notorious for his quarrelsome disposition, being constantly embroiled in bitter contentions with his brother bishops.

Constantine placed Christianity upon the throne. An execrable parricide, he put to death the two Licinii, the husband and son of his sister. He did not even spare his own children; and the Empress Fausta, the wife of this monster, was strangled in her bath by his orders. Upon consulting the pagan priests of the empire as to what expiation he should make for his crime, he was repulsed with horror by the priests, who exclaimed, "Far from hence be parricides, whom the gods never pardon." After this a Christian promised him pardon for his crimes if he should become purified in the waters of baptism, so the emperor became a Christian.

Eusebius, the father, or rather the manufacturer of ecclesiastical history, was superstitious, crafty, a time-server, a partisan, and a flatterer.

The works of Eusebius are a remarkable instance of the prostitution of great talents in the cause of mental degradation and slavery.

Callistus was a notorious thief and defaulter, who by a strange combination of circumstances was elevated from the workhouse to the Roman see.

Theodosius caused the massacre in cold blood of fifteen thousand innocent people. His persecution of the Arians has made his name forever infamous—outside of the Christian Church.

St. Cyril caused the murder of the talented and beautiful young philosopher, Hypatia, and through his machinations the famous Alexandrian library was destroyed.

Siricus derives his principal importance from his propagation of priestly celibacy in the fourth century.

Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, assisted by a friend, assaulted and beat Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, so severely that he died in three days; and this in the presence of his brother bishops, at the celebrated "Robber Council" of Ephesus.

St. Augustine, in his writings, laid down the laws and precepts by which the Church has been enabled to enslave, debase, and degrade mankind, and to make it resemble the ideal of total depravity upon which they build their scheme of salvation.

Simeon Stylites, the great ascetic, fanatic, and saint, was noted for his laziness, piety, and filthy habits. He lived on the top of a pillar until it resembled an exaggerated and unclean parrot's perch, and finally starved and stifled in the odor and effluvia of sanctity and filth—too lazy to descend from his pillar for food or fresh air.

Clovis the Great deliberately assassinated all the princes belonging to his family, but he spared no pains to propitiate the bishop of Rome, who, in consideration of his piety and usefulness, conferred upon him the title of "The Most Christian King, and Eldest Son of the Church."

Sixtus, the third bishop of Rome of that name, was guilty of incest and rape. When accused of the crime, he caused the accuser to be poisoned.

Virgilius was distinguished for his perfidy, debauchery, and crime. His life is one long record of abomination. He was a suborner and a sodomite, a knave, a miser, and an assassin. He killed with a club a poor child who resisted his infamous

embraces. Notwithstanding his crimes, he is now worshiped as a saint by all good Catholics.

Gregory the Great destroyed the monuments of Roman magnificence, set fire to the Palatine Library, destroyed the works of Titus Livy and the most famous Latin poets because they opposed superstitious worship, and he made war upon everything which bore the name of art or science.

Boniface III. was elevated to the see of Rome by Phocas, one of the most bloodthirsty monsters that ever cursed the earth.

Irene, empress of the East, one of the most zealous and pious of Christians, put out the eyes of her own son.

Pepin, King of France, was allied in succession with two of the popes of Rome in their iniquitous projects; and in order to make reparation to the Church for his usurpation of the crown of France, and the murder of his brother, he surrendered to the holy see the domains of Romagna which he had taken from the Lombards.

Charlemagne invaded Lombardy, deprived his nephews of their inheritance, despoiled his brother-in-law to punish him for having undertaken their defense, carried him to Lyons in chains, and condemned him to end his days in prison. Then Leo III. placed a crown of gold upon his head, and made him one of the chief pillars of the Christian Church.

Paschal I. put out the eyes and cut off the heads of Theodorus and Leo, two high officers of the Church, because they criticised his iniquities. After his death the people wished to drag his body through the streets of Rome, so great was their detestation of his crimes.

Popess Joan mounted the chair of St. Peter, celebrated mass, and created bishops. She became enciente by a cardinal and died in the pangs of child-birth, in the midst of a religious ceremony.

Nicholas I., for a large sum of money, not only pardoned but virtually endorsed the ravishment of Judith, daughter of Charles the Bold, by the count of Flanders. He was always ready to anathematize or flatter for gold. A French bishop,

in a letter to this pope, used the following language: "Thy cohort of priests, soiled with adulteries, incests, rapes, and assassinations, is well worthy to form thy infamous court, for Rome is the residence of demons, and thou, pope, art its Satan."

While Sergius was pope, he led publicly a life soiled with debaucheries with the famous courtesan Marozia, a monster of depravity who committed incests with her sons and grandsons.

John XI., son of Marozia, lived in incest with his mother while occupying the papal chair, as did also his brother, John XII. These two popes surpassed their infamous mother in vileness. They were guilty of profanity, blasphemy, adultery, incest with their mother, and murder.

John XIII. cut off the nose and lips of the Prefect Peter, and originated the ceremony of baptizing church bells.

Boniface VII. was the son of a Roman prostitute. His life was one long succession of infamies. Murders, poisonings, and judicial assassinations succeeded each other in such quick succession during his reign that writers of that time called him "Maliface."

Benedict IX. was made pope at the age of twelve years, and immediately surrendered himself to excessive depravity and the most shameful debaucheries. Twice he was driven in disgrace from the papal chair, and twice he returned. During his pontificate there was a double schism in the Church, so that there were three popes reigning at the same time.

Hildebrand, the poisoner of popes, the most deceitful of priests, usurped the pontifical seat under the name of Gregory VII. He excited civil wars and filled Germany and Italy with disorder, carnage, and murder. He excommunicated the emperor of Germany, took from him his title of king, freed his people from the oath of obedience, excited other princes against him, and at last reduced him to such a state of misfortune that he became almost insane.

Adrian IV., the son of an English friar, compelled the Emperor Barbarossa to act as his groom. The brave and

noble Arnold of Brescia was burned to death by this vicegerent of the Most High.

St. Dominic was sent forth by Innocent III. to persecute with fire and sword and unheard-of torments the unfortunate Waldenses. He swept through the land like a pestilence, the cross in one hand and the torch in the other, and sixty thousand victims were buried in the ruins of one city alone, merely because they could not subscribe to the dogmas of the Church. For more than twenty years Innocent III. carried on the persecutions of the Albigenses. His able and efficient agent in this horrible work, Simon de Montfort, was a monster of villainy and cruelty. His bloodthirsty nature made him a willing assistant of the Church in its relentless persecutions of the unfortunate unbelievers.

Innocent IV. betrayed the Emperor Frederic, and excited civil war in his dominions. Under his reign, the mendicant monks became the plague of Europe. He died of a disease brought on by his debaucheries.

Peter the Hermit inaugurated a series of crusades which cost Europe millions of lives and wasted untold treasures. He was a fanatic of the most dangerous kind, but is now among the saints of the Romish Church.

Boniface VIII. became pope after having assassinated his predecessor. He outraged the people, defied kings, pursued with hatred the Ghibelines, the partisans of the emperor of Germany, and invented the jubilees, which drew so much of the earnings of the poor into the coffers of the Church. The archbishop of Narbonne accused him of being a simoniac, an assassin, and a usurer, of living in concubinage with his two nieces, and of having children by them, and of having employed the riches extorted from the poor to bribe the Saracens to invade Italy.

John XXII. seized the tiara, seated himself on the pontifical throne, and proclaimed himself pope. In order to strengthen his usurpation, he launched his anathemas against the emperor of Germany and the king of France, persecuted sectarians, burned heretics, freed people from their allegiance,

armed princes for war against each other, invaded kingdoms, preached new crusades, sold benefices, and extorted from the faithful upwards of twenty-five millions of florins.

Clement VI. bought from the celebrated Joanna of Naples the country of Avignon, promising therefor three hundred thousand florins of gold, which he never paid, and declared her innocent of the murder of Andreas, her husband, whom she had caused to be assassinated.

Innocent VI. was elected pope after subscribing to a constitution and regulations framed by the cardinals for the protection of their interests. Immediately upon assuming the pontifical dignity he annulled his agreement and violated his oath by virtue of his infallibility. One of his minions assassinated the celebrated Rienzi. The reign of this pope was characterized by the persecutions of the Fratricellists.

Under Urban VI. commenced the great schism which divided the Church for so many years. After plotting the assassination of Queen Joanna of Naples, he was driven from Rome. After a short absence, he returned to the holy city and died of poison. During his pontificate the morals of the clergy had become terribly corrupted.

The sketch of the antipopes and counter-popes gives a charming picture of the "one true Church" during a period when it was presided over by a plurality of popes, each claiming to be the only true and infallible representative of Deity on earth. For years they convulsed Europe with their wars, during which they caused the deaths of untold thousands of innocent men.

Of St. Ursula very little is known. Her name, however, is one of the brightest in the long list of Catholic saints. As a general thing, the less historical facts there are known concerning Christian saints, the better their reputation for morality stands the test of modern criticism.

John XXIII., a most infamous monster, usurped the pontifical throne and terrified the cardinals into confirming him in his position. A terrible and bloody war between three rival popes, in which all southern Europe was involved,

followed this act. A general council assembled and proceeded to depose John. The bishops and cardinals accused him of murders, incests, poisoning, and sodomy; of having seduced and carried on a sacrilegious intercourse with three hundred religious women: of having violated three sisters: and of having imprisoned a whole family in order that he might act out his pleasure with the different members of it. He was eventually deposed.

Martin V., a vile and despicable pope, covered entire provinces with woful disaster, and caused the massacre of multitudes. His terrible decree against the Hussites spread devastation all over Germany. He caused the bones of Wickliffe to be burnt, and was guilty of private assassination and the slaughter of thousands and thousands of innocent men, women, and children.

Paul II. was a vile, vain, cruel, and licentious pontiff, whose chief delight consisted in torturing heretics with heated braziers and infernal instruments of torment. He died a victim of his gluttonous intemperance.

Torquemada, the human hyena, instituted the infernal Inquisition in Spain, and, during the eighteen years he was inquisitor-general, burnt 12,000 persons alive and 7,000 in effigy, imprisoned 90,000 for life, and tortured with all the hellish cruelty that ingenuity can devise over 100,000 more.

Ferdinand and Isabella. The sketch of these sovereigns embraces an account of their efforts to extirpate heresy in their dominions. The hapless Moors and Jews were driven out of Spain, and the diabolical fires of the Inquisition were lit throughout the kingdom. As the champions of Catholic Christianity these two otherwise humane rulers appear in the character of cruel and relentless bigots.

Alexander VI., was the most hideous monster whose name blackens the annals of Rome. All historians admit that this pope was one of the most dreadful of all men who have affrighted the world. His career was one prolonged carnival of the most monstrous crimes that the mind of man can conceive. Delivering himself up to incest and sodomy, debauch-

ery, assassination, and murder, and reveling in orgies, the mere description of which suffices to sicken the reader, he finally himself partook of the poison he had destined for two cardinals and ended his execrable life.

Martin Luther was a man of ungovernable passions and insane violence, who, becoming involved in a quarrel with the pope, was excommunicated; and then, in mad opposition, he threw off the obligations of his monkish vows, and with a band of protesting adherents undertook to play the part of a petty pope himself in Germany. He spent his life in fighting the mother Church and quarreling with his Protestant companions. He manifested the intensest hatred toward, and violently attacked everything not agreeable to his own will. He advocated persecution, denounced the discoveries of science, inveighed against Copernicus, calling him "an old fool," passed a stormy life in fighting religious foes and wrangling with his followers, and died, according to Mr. Segur, "forlorn of God, blaspheming to the very end."

John Calvin, a cold, calculating, cruel bigot, heartless and hypocritical, went to Geneva, and upon the ruins of the republic established the most terrible theocracy ever known among men. He sought to fasten the iron yoke of his detestable doctrines upon the necks of the people, and pounced upon all who opposed him with sanguinary ferocity. His two most diabolical acts were the execution of James Gruet, the poet, and the roasting to death of Michael Sêrvetus in a slow fire of green oak. The details of his acts of cold-blooded cruelty excite the horror even of a Christian.

Loyola and the Jesuits. Giving a graphic account of the career of the fanatical founder of the Society of Jesus, and of the rise, spread, workings, and plottings of his dark and dangerous order. Historical facts are adduced to show that it has been the secret source of all the horrors and enormities, tortures and crimes, that papal Rome has inflicted on mankind since its institution in 1538. This long indictment includes every conceivable atrocity of secret assassination and wholesale massacre.

Henry VIII. divorced two of his six wives, cut off the heads of two others, lit the fires of persecution, in which Catholics were burnt for recognizing the pope, and Protestants were burnt for not recognizing himself as head of the the Church of England. Charles Dickins says he was a "disgrace to human nature, and a blot of blood and grease upon the history of England."

Hernando Cortez. A brave but bigoted Spanish adventurer, who, under pretense of propagating the Christian religion in the New World, practiced the most inhuman barbarity upon the natives. Wholesale butchery marked his march through Mexico. Four millions of the population perished. Cortez found this newly discovered empire a heathen paradise, and left it a Christian waste.

Francisco Pizarro discovered and conquered Peru, and attempted to Christianize it by some of the most infamous acts of butchery and treachery that stain the records of crime. He massacred or burnt at the stake all who offered him the least opposition. He killed and ravaged and robbed in the name of the Church, and proved himself the most perfidious of those monsters of religion and cruelty who made it their life-work to reduce the aborigines of America to slavery.

Charles V., the most powerful monarch of the sixteenth century, introduced the Inquisition into his German provinces, erected scaffolds that were never empty, and lighted fires that never lacked for human fuel. In pursuance of his bloody edicts one hundred thousand Netherlanders were burned, beheaded, or buried alive.

Philip II., the crowned cut-throat, called the "Demon of the South," spent his whole life in the extirpation of heresy. He plotted the butchery of St. Bartholomew seventeen years before the hellish deed was done. He converted his dominions into a vast cemetery for the bodies of hundreds of thousands of his subjects executed upon the scaffold or burnt at the stake. He poisoned his own son, Don Carlos. The devilish details of his reign exhibit a cruelty and treachery with which nothing else in history will compare.

The Duke of Alva, one of the most ferocious and bloodthirsty monsters to which the Catholic Church has given birth, was a man of prodigious vices and no virtues. His career in the Netherlands was one saturnalia of blood and butchery. His horrible deeds of cruelty, detailed in this sketch, are sufficient to cause the heart of humanity to shudder for all time, and cause Nero and Caligula to be considered humane in comparison with him. Suffice it to say, he nearly depopulated the Dutch Provinces and converted them into a slaughter pen.

John Knox, a fiery, relentless, hard-hearted Scotch bigot, violated his vows to the Catholic faith by marriage, participated in the assassination of Cardinal Beatoun, cowardly fled to England and Geneva whenever he felt himself insecure at home; and whenever, with safety to himself, he could incite his countrymen to insurrection, he marched through Scotland at the head of a band of ranting preachers with the Gospel in one hand and a fire-brand in the other, burning churches and monasteries, and destroying the choicest libraries and works of art; conspired against his queen, the beautiful and unfortunate Mary, being accessory to the brutal assassination of her private secretary, instigated many dark deeds of blood and treachery, forged a letter, and by his foul plotting and heartless persecution became the most guilty accomplice in the base and barbarous execution of Mary, Queen of Scots.

Thomas Munzer was a German fanatic who, with a troop of violent Anabaptists, went through Germany burning and plundering, and spreading devastation and death. He and his band of outlaws caused the death of forty thousand people.

Mary of England was better known as "Bloody Mary." Her reign is one long catalogue of horrors. She caused to be burnt at the stake Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, together with three hundred men, women, and children.

Catherine de Medici led a life of poisoning and crime, procured the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in which one hundred thousand Huguenots were brutally butchered, and

poisoned her own son. Her execrable career makes a great blood-blot on the history of France.

The reign of Queen Elizabeth was one of turmoil and bloodshed. She established the High Commission, a terrible tribunal for the punishment of heresy against the Protestant faith, filled all the jails in her kingdom with prisoners, invented new and more cruel instruments of torture, murdered Mary of Scotland after keeping her in prison nineteen years, and put to death two hundred and four of her Catholic subjects on account of their religion.

Julius III. was a depraved debauchee and sodomite.

Pius IV. was notorious for his avarice, licentiousness, and gluttony. He filled the papal palace with courtesans and beautiful boys for the purpose of satisfying his sensual passions and assuaging his lubricity.

Pius V. was a heartless and sanguinary wretch whose chief delight seemed to consist in personally presiding over the tortures of heretics.

Gregory XIII. was accessory to the bloody butchery of St. Bartholomew. After the massacre he caused the cannon in the castle of San Angelo to be fired, published a jubilee throughout Europe, and caused a medal to be struck to commemorate the slaughter of one hundred thousand men, women, and children.

Sixtus V. announced that, like Christ, he had come to bring a sword, not peace. He celebrated his coronation by hanging sixty heretics. He was a cold and crafty man, and as vile a villain as ever sat in the chair of St. Peter.

James I. murdered Sir Walter Raleigh, filled England and Scotland with religious rancor and persecution, and caused the Bible to be translated.

Paul V. incited insurrection among the English Catholics, encouraged the terrible Gunpowder Plot, caused the body of the celebrated author, Dominis, to be burned with his books in the public square, and, according to the historian, wallowed like a hog in the most stinking and disgusting odors of adultery and sodomy that can be imagined.

The article on the Persecutions of Witches gives a summary account of witchcraft in different countries and ages, of the cruel codes, persecutions, and punishments imposed against it throughout Christendom, together with details of some of the most noteworthy trials

That on Protestant Persecutions gives a succinct history of the cruelty and tyranny perpetrated by the Protestant portion of the Christian Church from the Reformation to the present day. The details of the horrible and diabolical tortures inflicted by Protestant inquisitors constitute a bloody chapter indeed. Adherence to the Catholic faith was punished as the most atrocious of crimes. Massacre and murder kept pace with the progress of the doctrines of Luther and Calvin in the Old World and the New. The particulars of the inhuman barbarities practiced by Protestant persecutors are sufficient to sicken the most callous-hearted reader. Like the Catholics, they sought to extirpate heresy by fire and sword.

Urban VIII. secured a seat in the papal chair by treachery and force of arms; poisoned his opponents in the sacred college, and made Rome the theatre of violence, pillage, murder, and the most terrible atrocities; pursued a policy of intrigue which involved France and all Europe in a long and bloody war; assassinated the young duke of Urbino; handed Galileo over to the terrible tortures of the Inquisition, and died cursing and blaspheming.

James II. made war upon his Protestant subjects, turning loose upon them a ruthless band of outlaws under the cruel Kirk, who robbed and murdered them without mercy; commissioned the monstrous Jeffreys to go through the country holding his "Bloody Assize," and burn and hang indiscriminately; sent the ferocious Claverhouse to carry death and ruin among the covenanters of Scotland. His reign was a time of misery and terror.

Louis XIV. repealed the edict of Nantes, and attempted the total destruction of the Huguenots. He put to death or drove into exile the industrial population of France, made Paris a vast almshouse, and reduced the poor peasantry to

starvation. His reign was a period of disaster and national decay.

Innocent X. was a cruel, licentious pope who destroyed the city of Castro, placed the power of the papacy in the hands of a prostitute, taught the violation of oaths, and abandoned himself to the most disgusting debauchery.

St. Liguori was a great light of the Catholic Church, and promulgated the most execrable axioms ever taught, the gist of which was that deception, perjury, and crime were not only justifiable, but even praiseworthy when perpetrated for the interest of the Church and the greater glory of God.

Pius VI. was guilty of sodomy, adultery, incest, and murder: organized bands of brigands who ravaged the papal States: committed the most atrocious acts, poisoning and massacring all the French they could find: incited bands of fanatics to burn harvests, poison rivers and fountains, and plunge their hands in the blood of his foes.

The article on Christianity and Slavery portrays Christian opposition to freedom and its affiliation with the worst form of human slavery the world has known.

That devoted to Sinful Clergymen portrays near three hundred instances of gross licentiousness, bigamy, adultery, fornication, sodomy, and numerous other crimes.

Anthony Comstock has proved himself equal to almost any of his Christian predecessors in the work of arresting, persecuting, prosecuting, and ruining his fellow-beings. In the shameful qualities of falsehood, intrigue, entrapping, decoying unsuspecting victims, inveigling and tempting his fellow-beings to commit offenses, that he might be able to punish them, he stands without a peer in the Christian ranks. He boasts of having driven fifteen persons to suicide, and it is believed that he has driven an equal number to an involuntary death. The charge of perjury, too, hangs over him to that extent that he will find it impossible to remove it. As a champion of morality and decency, he is perhaps one of the most sensual, vile, and corrupt that has lived since the Christian rule began.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

THERE is but one conclusion at which the readers of these pages can arrive, and that is that the religion of Christianity has been one of cruel intolerance and bloody persecution. From the time it came to be a political power, early in the fourth century, until the present time, it has shown the same illiberal, intolerant, and exacting spirit. It has been unwilling, when it has had the power to prevent it, that any other creed should live by the side of it; it has been ready to hunt down, torture, rack, impale, hang, and burn every independent man and woman who has presumed to dissent from its prescribed line of belief. As Ingersoll forcibly states the facts: "In the name of God every possible crime has been committed—every conceivable outrage has been perpetrated. Brave men, tender and loving women, beautiful girls, and prattling babes have been exterminated in the name of Jesus Christ. For more than fifty generations the Church has carried the black flag. Her vengeance has been measured only by her power. During all these years of infamy no heretic has been forgiven. With the heart of a fiend she has hated; with the clutch of avarice she has grasped: with the jaws of a dragon she has devoured: pitiless as famine, merciless as fire, with the conscience of a serpent. Such is the history of the Church of God."

The work of persecution, torture, tyranny, and death to those who dared to dissent, as a matter of course, existed longer in the Romish Church than in its offspring, the Protestant, but this was only because its opportunities were more favorable to it. So far as the newer Church has had the power and the opportunity, it has shown the same bloodthirsty, fero-

cious, tyrannizing, and persecuting despotism. The world has advanced not a little in the last three centuries, and this progress has exercised a very modifying influence upon the newer form of faith. If Protestantism has been less bloody than Romanism, it is not because it is inherently better, but because its power for evil has been materially lessened. Under the same circumstances and with the same power, one would be no better than the other. With unlimited control, either would arrest, torture, burn, behead, and hang to-day with as much zest and pleasure as ever it did before.

Ingersoll says: "Men and women have been burned for thinking there was but one God; that there was none; that the Holy Ghost is younger than God; that God was somewhat older than his son; for insisting that good works will save a man without faith; that faith will not do without good works; for declaring that a sweet babe will not be burned eternally because its parents failed to have its head wet by a priest; for speaking of God as though he had a nose; for denying that Christ was his own father; for contending that three persons, rightly added together, make more than one; for believing in purgatory; for denying the reality of hell; for pretending that priests can forgive sins; for preaching that God is an essence; for denying that witches rode through the air on sticks; for doubting the total depravity of the human heart; for laughing at irresistible grace, predestination, and particular redemption; for denying that good bread could be made of the body of a dead man; for pretending that the pope was not managing this world for God, and in place of God; for disputing the efficacy of a vicarious atonement; for thinking that the Virgin Mary was born like other people; for thinking that a man's rib was hardly sufficient to make a good-sized woman; for denying that God used his finger for a pen; for asserting that prayers are not answered; that diseases are not sent to punish unbelief; for denying the authority of the Bible; for having a Bible in their possession; for attending mass, and for refusing to attend; for wearing a surplice; for carrying a cross, and for refusing; for being a

Catholic, and for being a Protestant; for being an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, a Baptist, and for being a Quaker. In short, every virtue has been a crime, and every crime a virtue. The Church has burned honesty and rewarded hypocrisy, and all this she did because it was commanded by a book—a book that man had been taught implicitly to believe long before they knew one word that was in it. They had been taught that to doubt the truth of this book—to examine it, even—was a crime of such enormity that it could not be forgiven, either in this world or in the next.

"Protestants and Catholics vied with each other in the work of enslaving the human mind. For ages they were rivals in the infamous effort to rid the earth of honest people. They infested every country, every city, town, hamlet, and family. They appealed to the worst passions of the human heart. They sowed the seeds of discord and hatred in every land. Brother denounced brother, wives informed against their husbands, mothers accused their children, dungeons were crowded with the innocent; the flesh of the good and the true rotted in the clasp of chains; the flames devoured the heroic, and, in the name of the most merciful God, his children were exterminated with famine, sword, and fire. Over the wild waves of battle rose and fell the banner of Jesus Christ. For sixteen hundred years the robes of the Church were red with innocent blood. The ingenuity of Christians was exhausted in devising punishment severe enough to be inflicted upon other Christians who honestly and sincerely differed with them upon any point whatever.

"Give any orthodox Church the power, and to-day they would punish heresy with the whip, and chain, and fire. As long as a Church deems a certain belief essential to salvation, just so long it will kill and burn if it has the power. Why should the Church pity a man whom her God hates? Why should she show mercy to a kind and noble heretic whom her God will burn in eternal fire? Why should a Christian be better than his God? It is impossible for the imagination to

conceive of a greater atrocity than has been perpetrated by the Church.

"Let it be remembered that all Churches have persecuted heretics to the extent of their power. Every nerve in the human body capable of pain has been sought out and touched by the Church. Toleration has increased only when and where the power of the Church has diminished. From Augustine until now the spirit of the Christian has remained the same. There has been the same intolerance, the same undying hatred of all who think for themselves, the same determination to crush out of the human brain all knowledge inconsistent with the ignorant creed.

"Every Church pretends that it has a revelation from God, and that this revelation must be given to the people through the Church: that the Church acts through its priests, and that ordinary mortals must be content with a revelation, not from God, but from the Church. Had the people submitted to this preposterous claim, of course there could have been but one Church, and that Church never could have advanced. It might have retrograded, because it is not necessary to think or investigate in order to forget. Without heresy there could have been no progress.

"The highest type of the orthodox Christian does not forget. Neither does he learn. He neither advances nor recedes. He is a living fossil, imbedded in that rock called faith. He makes no effort to better his condition, because all his strength is exhausted in keeping other people from improving theirs. The supreme desire of his heart is to force all others to adopt his creed, and in order to accomplish this object he denounces all kinds of Freethinking as a crime, and this crime he calls heresy. When he had the power, heresy was the most terrible and formidable of words. It meant confiscation, exile, imprisonment, torture, and death.

"In those days the cross and rack were inseperable companions. Across the open Bible lay the sword and fagot. Not content with burning such heretics as were alive, they even tried the dead, in order that the Church might rob their

wives and children. The property of all heretics was confiscated, and on this account they charged the dead with being heretical—indicted, as it were, their dust, to the end that the Church might clutch the bread of orphans. Learned divines discussed the propriety of tearing out the tongues of heretics before they were burned, and the general opinion was that this ought to be done, so that the heretics should not be able, by uttering blasphemies, to shock the Christians who were burning them. With a mixture of ferocity and Christianity, the priests insisted that heretics ought to be burned at a slow fire, giving as a reason, that more time was given them for repentance.

"No wonder that Jesus Christ said, 'I come not to bring peace but a sword!' Every priest regarded himself as the agent of God. He answered all questions by authority, and to treat him with disrespect was an insult offered to God. No one was asked to think, but all were commanded to obey.

"In 1208 the Inquisition was established. Seven years afterward, the fourth council of the Lateran enjoined all kings and rulers to swear an oath that they would exterminate heretics from their dominions. The sword of the Church was unsheathed, and the world was at the mercy of ignorant and infuriated priests, whose eyes feasted upon the agonies they inflicted. Acting as they believed, or pretended to believe, under the command of God, stimulated by the hope of infinite reward in another world, hating heretics with every drop of their bestial blood, savage beyond description, merciless beyond conception, these infamous priests, in a kind of frenzied joy, leaped upon the helpless victims of their rage. They crushed their bones in iron boots, tore their quivering flesh with iron hooks and pincers, cut off their lips and eyelids, pulled out their nails, and into the bleeding quick thrust needles, tore out their tongues, extinguished their eyes, stretched them upon racks, flayed them alive, crucified them with the head downward, exposed them to wild beasts, burned them at the stake, mocked their cries and groans,

ravished their wives, robbed their children, and then prayed God to finish the holy work in hell.

"Millions upon millions were sacrified upon the altars of bigotry. The Catholic burned the Lutheran, the Lutheran burned the Catholic: the Episcopalian tortured the Presbyterian, the Presbyterian tortured the Episcopalian. Every denomination killed all it could of every other; and each Christian felt in duty bound to exterminate every other Christian who denied the smallest fraction of his creed. According to the creed of every Church, slavery leads to heaven, liberty leads to hell. It was claimed that God had founded the Church, and that to deny the authority of the Church was to be a traitor to God, and consequently an ally of the devil. To torture and destroy one of the soldiers of Satan was a duty no good Christian cared to neglect. Nothing can be sweeter than to earn the gratitude of God by killing your own enemies. Such a mingling of profit and revenge, of heaven for yourself and damnation for those you dislike, is a temptation that your ordinary Christian never resists.

"According to the theologians, God, the Father of us all, wrote a letter to his children. The children have always differed somewhat as to the meaning of this letter. In consequence of these honest differences, those brothers began to cut out each other's hearts. In every land, where this letter from God has been read, the children to whom and for whom it was written have been filled with hatred and malice. They have imprisoned and murdered each other, and the wives and children of each other."

Again the same writer says: "For thousands of years a thinker was hunted down like an escaped convict. To him who had braved the Church every door was shut, every knife was open. To shelter him from the wild storm, to give him a crust of bread when dying, to put a cup of water to his cracked and bleeding lips; these were all crimes, not one of which the Church ever did forgive; and with the justice taught of her God, his helpless children were exterminated as scorpions and vipers.

"Who at the present day can imagine the courage, the devotion to principle, the intellectual and moral grandeur it once required to be an Infidel, to brave the Church, her racks, her fagots, her dungeons, her tongues of fire: to defy and scorn her heaven and her hell, her devil and her God? They were the noblest sons of earth. They were the real saviors of our race, the destroyers of superstition and the creators of science. They were the real Titans who bared their grand foreheads to all the thunderbolts of all the gods.

"The Church has been, and still is, the great robber. She has rifled not only the pockets but the brains of the world. She is the stone at the sepulchre of liberty; the upas tree in whose shade the intellect of man has withered: the Gorgon beneath whose gaze the human heart has turned to stone.

"Christianity has always opposed every forward movement of the human race. Across the highway of progress it has always been building breastworks of Bibles, tracts, commentaries, prayer-books, creeds, dogmas, and platforms: and at every advance the Christians have gathered behind these heaps of rubbish and shot the poisoned arrows of malice at the soldiers of freedom.

"And even the Liberal Christian of to-day has his holy of holies, and in the niche of the temple of his heart has his idol. He still clings to a part of the old superstition, and all the pleasant memories of the old belief linger in the horizon of his thoughts like a sunset. We associate the memory of those we love with the religion of our childhood. It seems almost a sacrilege to rudely destroy the idols that our fathers worshiped, and turn their sacred and beautiful truths into the silly fables of barbarism. Some throw away the Old Testament and cling to the New, while others give up everything except the idea that there is a personal God, and that in some wonderful way we are the objects of his care."

On another occasion he said: "Through all the centuries gone, the mind of man has been beleaguered by the mailed hosts of superstition. Slowly and painfully has advanced the army of deliverance. Hated by those they wished to

rescue, despised by those they were dying to save, these grand soldiers, these immortal deliverers, have fought without thanks, labored without applause, suffered without pity, and they have died execrated and abhorred. For the good of mankind they accepted isolation, poverty, and calumny. They gave up all, sacrificed all, lost all but truth and respect.

"No effort has been, in any age of the world, spared to crush out opposition. The Church used painting, music, and architecture simply to degrade mankind. But there are men that nothing can awe. There have been at all times brave spirits that dared even the gods. Some proud head has always been above the waves. In every age some Diogenes has sacrificed to all the gods. True genius never cowers, and there is always some Samson feeling for the pillars of authority.

"Cathedrals and domes, and chimes and chants, temples frescoed and groined and carved, and gilded with gold, altars and tapers, and paintings of virgin and babe, censer and chalice, chasuble, paten, and alb; organs and anthems, and incense rising to the winged and blest, maniple, amice, and stole, crosses and crosiers, tiaras and crowns, mitres and missals and masses, rosaries, relics and robes, martyrs and saints, and windows stained as with the blood of Christ, never for one moment awed the brave, proud spirit of a true Infidel. He knew that all the pomp and glitter had been purchased with liberty—that priceless jewel of the soul. In looking at the cathedral he remembered the dungeon. The music of the organ was not loud enough to drown the clank of fetters. He could not forget that the taper had lighted the fagot. He knew that the cross adorned the hilt of the sword, and so, where others worshiped, he wept and scorned.

"The doubter, the investigator, the Infidel, have been the saviors of liberty. This truth is beginning to be realized, and the intellectual are beginning to honor the brave thinkers of the past.

"But the Church is as unforgiving as ever, and still wonders why any Infidel should be wicked enough to endeavor to destroy her power.

"I will tell the Church why.

"You have imprisoned the human mind: you have b[ound] it the enemy of liberty; you have burned us at the sta[ke] wasted us upon slow fires, torn our flesh with iron: you h[ave] covered us with chains, treated us as outcasts: you h[ave] filled the world with fear: you have taken our wives [and] children from our arms: you have confiscated our proper[ty] you have denied us the right to testify in courts of justi[ce] you have branded us with infamy; you have torn out [our] tongues; you have refused us burial. In the name of yo[ur] religion, you have robbed us of every right: and after having inflicted upon us every evil that can be inflicted in this world, you have fallen upon your knees, and with clasped hands, implored your God to torment us forever.

"Can you wonder that we hate your doctrines, that we despise your creeds, that we feel proud to know that we are beyond your power, that we are free in spite of you, that we can express our honest thought, and that the whole world is grandly rising into the blessed light?

"Can you wonder that we point with pride to the fact that Infidelity has ever been found battling for the rights of man, for the liberty of conscience, and for the happiness of all?

"Can you wonder that we are proud to know that we have always been disciples of Reason and soldiers of Freedom; that we have denounced tyranny and superstition, and have kept our hands unstained with human blood?

"We deny that religion is the end or object of this life. When it is so considered it becomes destructive of happiness, —the real end of life. It becomes a hydra-headed monster, reaching in terrible coils from the heavens, and thrusting its thousand fangs into the bleeding, quivering hearts of men. It devours their substance, builds palaces for God (who dwells not in temples made with hands), and allows his children to die in huts and hovels. It fills the earth with mourning, heaven with hatred, the present with fear, and all the future with despair.

"Virtue is a subordination of the passions to the intellect. It is to act in accordance with your highest convictions. It does not consist in believing, but in doing.

"This is the sublime truth that the Infidels in all ages have uttered. They have handed the torch from one to the other through all the years that have fled. Upon the altar of Reason they have kept the sacred fire, and through the long midnight of faith, they feed the divine flame.

"Infidelity is liberty: all religion is slavery. In every creed, man is the slave of God, woman is the slave of man, and the sweet children are the slaves of all.

"We do not want creeds; we want knowledge, we want happiness.

"And yet we are told by the Church that we have accomplished nothing: that we are simply destroyers; that we tear down without building again.

"Is it nothing to free the mind? Is it nothing to civilize mankind? Is it nothing to fill the world with light, with discovery, with science? Is it nothing to dignify man and exalt the intellect? Is it nothing to grope your way into the dreary prisons, the damp and dropping dungeons, the dark and silent cells, where the souls of men are chained to the floors of stone; to greet them like a ray of light, like the song of a bird, the murmur of a stream; to see the dull eyes open and grow slowly bright; to feel yourself grasped by the shrunken and unused hands, and hear yourself thanked by a strange and hollow voice?

"Is it nothing to conduct these souls gradually into the blessed light of day, to let them see again the happy fields, the sweet, green earth, and hear the everlasting music of the waves? Is it nothing to make men wipe the dust from their swollen knees, the tears from their blanched and furrowed cheeks? Is it a small thing to reave the heavens of an insatiate monster and write upon the eternal dome, glittering with stars, the grand word—FREEDOM?

"Is it a small thing to quench the flames of hell with the holy tears of pity, to unbind the martyr from the stake,

break all the chains, put out the fires of civil war, stay the sword of the fanatic, and tear the bloody hands of the Church from the white throat of Science?

"Is it a small thing to make men truly free, to destroy the dogmas of ignorance, prejudice, and power, the poisoned fables of superstition, and drive from the beautiful face of the earth the fiend of Fear?

"It does seem as though the most zealous Christian must at times entertain some doubt as to the divine origin of his religion. For eighteen hundred years the doctrine has been preached. For more than a thousand years the Church had, to a great extent, control of the civilized world, and what has been the result? Are the Christian nations patterns of charity and forbearance?

"On the contrary, their principal business is to destroy each other. More than five millions of Christians are trained, educated, and drilled to murder their fellow-Christians. Every nation is groaning under a vast debt incurred in carrying on war against other Christians or defending themselves from Christian assault. The world is covered with forts to protect Christians from Christians: and every sea is covered with iron monsters ready to blow Christian brains into eternal froth. Millions upon millions are annually expended in the effort to construct still more deadly and terrible engines of death. Industry is crippled, honest toil is robbed, and even beggary is taxed to defray the expenses of Christian warfare. There must be some other way to reform this world. We have tried creed, and dogma, and fable, and they have failed; and they have failed in all the nations dead.

"The people perish for the lack of knowledge.

"Nothing but education, scientific education, can benefit mankind. We must find out the laws of nature and conform to them.

"We need free bodies and free minds, free labor and free thought, chainless hands and fetterless brains. Free labor will give us wealth. Free thought will give us truth.

"We need men with moral courage to speak and write their

real thoughts, and to stand by their convictions, even to the very death. We need have no fear of being too radical. The future will verify all grand and brave predictions.

"Science, the great Iconoclast, has been busy since 1809, and by the highway of Progress are the broken images of the past.

"On every hand the people advance. The vicar of God has been pushed from the throne of the Cæsars, and upon the roofs of the eternal city falls once more the shadow of the Eagle.

"All has been accomplished by the heroic few. The men of science have explored heaven and earth, and, with infinite patience, have furnished the facts. The brave thinkers have used them. The gloomy caverns of superstition have been transformed into temples of thought, and the demons of the past are the angels of to-day.

"Science took a handful of sand, constructed a telescope, and with it explored the starry depths of heaven. Science wrested from the gods their thunderbolts; and now the electric spark, freighted with thought and love, flashes under all the waves of the sea. Science took a tear from the cheek of unpaid labor, converted it into steam, created a giant that turns with tireless arm the countless wheels of toil."

How unfounded are the claims of the Church, that its religion has been one of beneficience, and that it has been the source of the advanced state of civilization that obtains in the world to-day! It has shed more blood in its own name than have all the other religions of the world combined, including Mohammedanism, which has been next to Christianity in cruelty. While the pagan religionists of the eastern world were pursuing the even tenor of their way, killing none because they did not believe as they did, Christians were saturating the earth with the blood of its children, and doing all in their power to force back the incentives to science, education, and a better civilization. The Christian rule, besides being a reign of bloodshed, terror, and the most cruel persecution, has been the most powerful impediment in the

path of the progress of the human race. It has upheld the worst forms of superstition and error that the world has ever known. Its contest with growing science has been bloody and persistent. It has resorted to all its hellish arts and infernal inventions to throttle the comely young child of education, and to keep alive the grim and horrible monster of ignorance and blind faith. It has cherished, petted, fed, clothed, and made powerful the worst and most oppressive priesthood that has cursed the earth.

But its power is weakening. Its clutch at the throat of science is growing weaker year by year. A few more decades and its strength will become so exhausted, and its venom so far spent, that an era of light, knowledge, equality, and mental liberty may be ardently hoped for to reign on the earth.

As science gains supremacy over the myths and fables of superstition, persecution will more and more pass away. Men will be less disposed to torture each other and take each other's lives because their opinions cannot always exactly correspond. The more superstition and faith, the more persecution and bloodshed. The more science and demonstrated knowledge prevail among men, the more toleration and perfect freedom of opinion will abound. As supernaturalism retires to the rear and Rationalism and a belief in the laws of the universe advance and are looked to for guidance and wisdom, the more the happiness of our race will be secured, and the sooner will the enmity and cruel jealousies arising from diverging religious creeds cease to have an existence among the sons of men. Ignorance has been the great devil of the world, and science is its great savior. May it never more be crucified as have been the numerous fabled saviors of the past.

The conflict between religion and science, which, for two or three centuries, has been waxing more and more heated, is bound to continue until the weaker contestant is crushed to death. The enmity between them is irreconcilable, and no truce can be proclaimed that will have a lasting effect. The

main contest must be between the Church of Rome on the one hand and Rationalism on the other. Protestantism is midway between the two, and must ultimately take sides with one or the other of the combatants. It cannot remain permanently where it is, and it is ardently to be hoped that the larger portion will step over on the side of science, reason, and truth.

In view of the irrepressible conflict alluded to, Prof. Draper uses this appropriate language: "As to the issue of the coming conflict, can any one doubt? Whatever is resting on fiction and fraud will be overthrown. Institutions that organize impostures and spread delusions must show what right they have to exist. Faith must render an account of herself to Reason. Mysteries must give place to facts. Religion must relinquish that imperious, that domineering position which she has so long maintained against science. There must be absolute freedom for thought. The ecclesiastic must learn to keep himself within the domain he has chosen, and cease to tyrannize over the philosopher, who, conscious of his own strength and the purity of his motives, will bear such interference no longer. What was written by Esdras, near the willow-fringed rivers of Babylon, more than twenty-three centuries ago, still holds good: 'As for truth, it endureth and is always strong: it liveth and conquereth for evermore.'"

The World's Sages, Thinkers, and Reformers.

Being biographical sketches of distinguished Teachers, Philosophers, Innovators, Skeptics, Infidels, Founders of new schools of Thought and Religion, Disbelievers in current Theology, and the most active Humanitarians of the world.

By D. M. BENNETT, Editor of "The Truth Seeker." Cloth $3; leather, red edges $4; morocco, gilt edges $4.50.

THE ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

BY VISCOUNT AMBERLEY.

An elaborate examination into the origin and nature of the various religions of the world. A work of great research, embodying a large amount of valuable information on the Origin of Religions. Its radical character excited the enmity of the leaders of the English Church, and great efforts were made by the Duke of Bedford and others to suppress it, which did not succeed. It attracted much attention in England as well as America.

Faithfully produced, complete, from the London (two vol. octavo) edition, which sells at from $12 to $15. Price of this edition as above.

The Great Works of Thomas Paine, Complete.

Containing Life of Paine. Common Sense. The Crisis. The Rights of Man, The Age of Reason. Examination of Prophecies, Reply to the Bishop of Llandaff. Letter to Mr. Erskine. An Essay on Dreams. Letter to Camille Jordan. The Religion of Deism. Letter to Samuel Adams, etc. Price as above.

THE CHAMPIONS OF THE CHURCH.

Being biographical sketches of eminent Christians, from the reputed founder of Christianity to the present time. A companion book to "The World's Sages, Thinkers, and Reformers," containing a correct history of the distinguished ornaments and diabolical characters of both the Romish and Protestant Churches. Also a full history of the bloody wars of Christianity which have been inhumanly waged to spread its rule. It contains a history of Jesuitism, the abominations of the Inquisition, Catholic and Protestant persecutions, etc., etc., and all from recognized Christian authorities. 1120 pages, octavo. Price as above. By D. M. BENNETT, Editor of "The Truth Seeker."

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION.

BY PROF. W. K. CLIFFORD, F.R.S.

This remarkable and very able work was published anonymously in London, in three volumes, octavo, and doubtless excited more attention and criticism from theologians than any similar work that has appeared for the last century. It is unquestionably the ablest examination into the claims of Supernatural and Revealed Religion of any work that has as yet appeared. It exhausts the subjects of Miracles, The Synoptic Gospels, The Fourth Gospel, The Acts of the Apostles, The Resurrection and the Ascension, and contains full replies to the author's critics. Published complete in one volume, from the last London edition, including Greek and Hebrew quotations.

The English edition costs $12.50. The price of this complete edition, in cloth, $3.50; leather, red edges, $4.50; morocco, gilt edges, $5.

The five volumes here designated sent by mail, in cloth, at $12.50. By express, $11; in leather, by mail $15; by express, $13.50. In morocco and gilt, by mail, $20; by express, $18.

Interrogatories to Jehovah, offered up from "The Truth Seeker" office. A series of close questions upon a great variety of subjects, to which answers are desired, from the Origin of Deity and the Universe, the Creation of the Earth, Man, and Woman, the Flood, the Bible, the Old Patriarchs and Prophets, down to the Doctrinal Points embraced by the Church. A bold and radical work. By D. M. BENNETT. 12mo. 250 pp. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

The Humphrey-Bennett Discussion. A Debate between Rev. G. H. HUMPHREY, Presbyterian clergyman, and D. M. BENNETT, Editor of "The Truth Seeker," held in the columns of "The Truth Seeker," commencing April 7, 1877, and continuing nearly six months. Three propositions were discussed, as follows: 1. Did Unbelievers in the Bible do as much for American Independence as Believers in it? 2. Has Infidelity done as much as Christianity to Promote Learning and Science? 3. Is there a Stronger Probability that Infidelity is True than that the Bible is Divine? Bennett affirming, Humphrey denying. The discussion attracted marked attention both from believers and unbelievers in revealed religion, as in it both sides were fairly represented. 12mo. 550 pp. Cloth, $1.00.

Career of Religious Ideas. THEIR ULTIMATE THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE. An able examination of the sources of the past religions of the world. The subjects are treated in chapters separately as follows: 1. Introductory; 2. What is Religion? 3. Fetichism; 4. Polytheism; 5. Monotheism; 6. Value of Ancient Bibles; Man's Moral Progress Dependent on his Intellectual Growth; 8. The Great Theological Problems: 9. Man's Fall: 10. Man's Position—Fate, Free-will, Free-agency, Necessity, Responsibility; 11. Duties and Obligations of Man to God and to Himself: 12. The Ultimate of Religious Ideas. By HUDSON TUTTLE. 140 pp. 12mo. Paper, 50 cts; cloth, 75 cts.

The Last Will and Testament of Jean Meslier, Curate of the Romish Church in France in the eighteenth century, whose views upon theology were not published until after his death, and are now for the first time presented in English. Very radical. Price, 25 cents.

The Influence of Christianity upon Civilization. By B. F. UNDERWOOD. One of the most able treatises upon the subject ever written. Price, 25 cents.

Christianity and Materialism. By B. F. UNDERWOOD. In this treatise the two systems are fairly and ably examined from a historical standpoint. Price, 15 cents.

The Resurrection of Jesus. By W. S. BELL. Revised and enlarged edition. Price, 25 cents.

Religion Not History. An able examination of the morals and theology of the teachings of the New Testament. By W. F. NEWMAN, Emeritus Professor of University College, London. From the London edition. Price 25 cents.

The Bennett-Teed Discussion. Between D. M. BENNETT, editor of "The Truth Seeker," and CYRUS ROMULUS R. TEED, of Moravia, N. Y. Propositions discussed: "Jesus Christ is not only Divine, but is the Lord God, Creator of Heaven and Earth." Teed affirming, Bennett denying. Paper, 30 cents; cloth, 50 cents.

Chronicles of Simon Christianus. His Manifold and Wonderful Adventures in the Land of Cosmos. A New Scripture from an antique manuscript (evidently inspired), discovered by I. N. FIDEL, in conjunction with A. HOOK, Esq. Very amusing. Price, 25 cents.

What I Don't Believe; What I Do Believe; Why, and Wherefore. Forthcoming. By D. M. BENNETT, Editor of "The Truth Seeker." It covers about all the ground within the domain of Theology, Mysticism, Bible-olatry, Judaism, Christianity, Miracles, Supernaturalism, Faith, Humanitarianism, Common Sense, etc, 450 pp. 12mo. Paper, 75 cents; cloth, $1.00.

THIRTY DISCUSSIONS,

Bible Stories, Lectures and Essays.

BY D. M. BENNETT,

Editor of "The Truth Seeker;"

Including "A Discussion on Prayer with two Clergymen," "The Story of Creation," "The Old Snake Story," "The Story of the Flood," "The Plagues of Egypt," "Korah, Datham and Abiram," "Balaam and his Ass," "Arraignment of Pries'craft," "Joshua Stopping the Sun and Moon," "Samson and his Exploits," "The Great Wrestling Match," "Discussion with Elder Shelton," "Reply to Elder Shelton's Fourth Letter," "Discussion with George Snode," "Honest Questions and Honest Answers," "The Gods of Superstition and the God of the Universe," "Moving the Ark," "Bennett's Prayer to the Devil," "Our Ecclesiastical Gentry," "Elijah the Tishbite," "Christianity a Borrowed System," "Elisha the Prophet," "Did Jesus Really Exist?" "Jonah and the Big Fish," "An Open Letter to Jesus Christ," "The Ills we Endure, their Cause and Cure," "Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego," "Daniel in the Lion's Den," "An Hour with the Devil," "Discussion with Erastus F. Brown," "The Fear of Death." The whole comprises nearly seven hundred pages, and the subjects treated can hardly prove uninteresting to the reader. A wood-cut likeness of the author also accompanies the work. Price, 75 cents in paper; $1.00 in cloth.

THE BURGESS-UNDERWOOD DEBATE,

BETWEEN

PROF. O. A. BURGESS,

President of the Northwestern Christian University of Indianapolis, Ind.,

AND

B. F. UNDERWOOD,

Of Boston, Mass.

Held during four days at Aylmer, Ont., commencing June 29, 1875

REPORTED BY JOHN T. HAWKE.

First Proposition.—"The Christian Religion, as set forth in the New Testament, is true in fact, and of divine origin." BURGESS in the affirmative; UNDERWOOD in the negative.

Second Proposition.—"The Bible is erroneous in many of its teachings regarding Science and Morals, and is of human origin." UNDERWOOD in the affirmative; BURGESS in the negative.

Every person fond of hearing both sides of questions of the magnitude of those here presented, will, in this volume, be thoroughly pleased, and should avail himself of the opportunity of procuring it. 12mo., 180 pp. Price, in paper, 60 cents: in cloth, $1.

THE GODS AND OTHER LECTURES

BY COL. ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

Cheap Edition. Containing in full, "Oration on the Gods," "Humboldt," "Thomas Paine," "Arraignment of the Church, or Individuality," and "Heretics and Heresies." Among all the works from the Liberal press, in force, clearness, incisiveness, eloquence and originality, none equal these admirable lectures. Let everybody secure a copy. Price, in paper, 30 cents; cloth, 50 cents.

TRUTH SEEKER TRACTS.

Bound Volumes I., II., III. and IV. These volumes, containing over 500 pages each are made up of over one hundred Truth Seeker Tracts as given in "The Truth Seeker;" with some added. They embrace a variety of subjects by different authors, and in a terse, trenchant, and spicy style. Many commendations have been received of the valuable and useful character of The Truth Seeker Tracts, and the great good they are doing in the community. It is found very convenient to have them bound in volumes for preservation, perusal and reference. Each volume will contain a wood-cut likeness of the publisher and part author. They are offered to the public at the extremely low price of 60 cents per volume in paper covers; and $1.00 in cloth; or $1.50 for the first three volumes in paper, and $2 50 for the first three volumes in cloth, or $2.00 for the four volumes in paper, and $3.25 for the four volumes in cloth.

THE OUTCAST.

BY WINWOOD READE.

Author of "The Martyrdom of Man," etc.

The English edition of "The Outcast" sells at $2.00. This full and perfect edition we sell at 30 cents, in paper; 50 cents in cloth.

THE ADVENTURES OF ELDER TRIPTOLEMUS TUB:

Comprising Important and Startling Disclosures Concerning Hell; Its Magnitude, Morals, Employments, Climate, etc. All very authentic. By Rev. George Rogers. A rich, interesting little work. In paper, 25 cents.

BLAKEMAN'S TWO HUNDRED POETICAL RIDDLES,

(for children and youth,) embracing a great variety of subjects. This little work is new and interesting, and affords a great amount of amusement in the family circle, as well as in gatherings of children and older people. Price, 20 cents.

D. M. BENNETT,

Liberal and Scientific Publishing House,

Science Hall, 141 Eighth St., New York.

TRUTH SEEKER TRACTS.

No.	(REVISED LIST.)	Cts.
1	Discussion on Prayer. D. M. Bennett and two Clergymen	8
2	Oration on the Gods. R. G. Ingersoll	10
3	Thomas Paine. R. G. Ingersoll	5
4	Arraignment of the Church. R. G. Ingersoll	5
5	Heretics and Heresies. R. G. Ingersoll	5
6	Humboldt. R. G. Ingersoll	5
7	The Story of Creation. D. M. Bennett	5
8	The Old Snake Story. D. M. Bennett	2
9	The Story of the Flood. D. M. Bennett	5
10	The Plagues of Egypt. D. M. Bennett	2
11	Korah, Datham, and Abiram. D. M. Bennett	2
12	Balaam and his Ass. D. M. Bennett	2
13	Arraignment of Priestcraft. D. M. Bennett	8
14	Old Abe and Little Ike. John Syphers	3
15	Come to Dinner. J. Syphers	2
16	Fog Horn Documents. J. Syphers	2
17	The Devil Still Ahead. J. Syphers	2
18	Slipped Up Again. J. Syphers	2
19	Joshua Stopping the Sun and Moon. D. M. Bennett	2
20	Samson and his Exploits. D. M. Bennett	2
21	The Great Wrestling Match. D. M. Bennett	2
22	Discussion with Elder Shelton. D. M. Bennett	10
23	Reply to Elder Shelton's Fourth Letter. D. M. Bennett	3
24	Christians at Work. Wm. McDonnell	5
25	Discussion with Geo. Snode. D. M. Bennett	5
26	Underwood's Prayer	1
27	Honest Questions and Honest Answers. D. M. Bennett	5
28	Alessandro di Cagliostro. C. Sotheran	10
29	Paine Hall Dedication Address. B. F. Underwood	2
30	Woman's Rights and Man's Wrongs. J. Syphers	2
31	Gods and God-houses J. Syphers	2
32	The Gods of Superstition and the God of the Universe. Bennett	8
33	What has Christianity Done? S. H. Preston	3
34	Tribute to Thomas Paine. S. H. Preston	2
35	Moving the Ark. D. M. Bennett	2
36	Bennett's Prayer to the Devil	2
37	Short Sermon. Rev. Theologicus, D.D.	2
38	Christianity not a Moral System. X. Y. Z.	2
39	The True Saint. S. P. Putnam	1
40	Bible of Nature *vs.* The Bible of Men. J. Syphers	3
41	Our Ecclesiastical Gentry. D. M. Bennett	1
42	Elijah the Tishbite. D. M. Bennett	3
43	Christianity a Borrowed System. D. M. Bennett	3
44	Design Argument Refuted. Underwood	3
45	Elisha the Prophet. D. M. Bennett	3
46	Did Jesus Really Exist? D. M. Bennett	3
47	Cruelty and Credulity of the Human Race. Dr. Daniel Arter	3
48	Freethought in the West. G. L. Henderson	5
49	Sensible Conclusions. E. E. Guild	5
50	Jonah and the Big Fish. D. M. Bennett	3
51	Sixteen Truth Seeker Leaflets. No. 1	5
52	Marples-Underwood Debate. B. F. Underwood	3
53	Questions for Bible Worshipers. B. F. Underwood	2
54	An Open Letter to Jesus Christ. D. M. Bennett	5

55 The Bible God Disproved by Nature. W. E. Coleman..... 2
56 Bible Contradictions..... 1
57 Jesus not a Perfect Character. Underwood..... 2
58 Prophecies....."..... 2
59 Bible Prophecies Concerning Babylon. Underwood..... 2
60 Ezekiel's Prophecies Concerning Tyre....."..... 2
61 History of the Devil. Paden..... 5
62 The Jews and their God. Paden..... 10
63 The Devil's Due-Bills. Syphers..... 3
64 The Ills we Endure—Their Cause and Cure. Bennett..... 5
65 Short Sermon No. 2. Rev. Theologicus, D. D..... 2
66 God-Idea in History. H. B. Brown..... 5
67 Sixteen Truth Seeker Leaflets. No. 2..... 5
68 Ruth's Idea of Heaven and Mine. Su an H. Wixon..... 2
69 Missionaries. Mrs. E. D. Slenker..... 2
70 Vicarious Atonement. J. S. Lyon..... 3
71 Paine's Anniversary. C. A. Codman..... 2
72 Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Bennett..... 2
73 Foundations. Syphers..... 2
74 Daniel in the Lion's Den. Bennett..... 2
75 An Hour with the Devil....."..... 10
76 Reply to Erastus F. Brown... "..... 3
77 The Fear of Death....."..... 5
78 Christmas and Christianity. ."..... 5
79 The Relationship of Jesus, Jehovah, and the Virgin Mary. W. E. Coleman..... 2
80 Address on Paine's 139th Birthday. Bennett..... 5
81 Hereafter: or, the Half-Way House. Syphers..... 2
82 Christian Courtesy. Bennett..... 1
83 Revivalism Examined. Dr. A. G. Humphrey..... 5
84 Moody's Sermon on Hell. Rev. J. P. Hopps, London..... 2
85 Matter, Motion, Life, and Mind. Bennett..... 10
86 An Enquiry About God's Sons....."..... 2
87 Freethought Judged by its Fruits. Underwood..... 1
88 David, God's Peculiar Favorite. Mrs. Slenker..... 3
89 Logic of Prayer. C. Stephenson..... 3
90 Biblo-Mania. Otter Cordates..... 2
91 Our Ideas of God. Underwood..... 1
92 The Bible; is it Divinely Inspired? D. Arter..... 2
93 Obtaining Pardon for Sins. Hudson Tuttle..... 1
94 The New Raven. Will Cooper..... 5
95 Jesus Christ. Bennett..... 10
96 Ichabod Crane Papers..... 10
97 Special Providences. W. S. Bell..... 2
98 Snakes. Mrs. E. D. Slenker..... 2
99 Do the Works of Nature Prove a Creator? Sciota..... 2
100 The Old and the New. Ingersoll..... 5
101 140th Anniversary of Thomas Paine's Birthday. Bennett *et als*..... 5
102 The Old Religion and the New. W. S. Bell..... 1
103 Does the Bible Teach us all we know? Bennett..... 2
104 Evolution of Israel's God. A. L. Rawson..... 10
105 Decadence of Christianity. Capphro..... 2
106 Franklin, Washington, and Jefferson, Unbelievers..... 2
107 The Safe Side. H. B. Brown..... 5
108 The Holy Bible a Historical Humbug. S. H. Preston..... 2
109 Ghosts. Ingersoll..... 5
110 Invocation to the Universe. Bennett..... 1
111 Reply to Scientific American. Bennett..... 1
112 Sensible Sermon. Rev. M. J. Savage..... 2

113 Come to Jesus. Bennett..... 2
114 Where was Jesus Born? S. H. Preston..... 1
115 The Wonders of Prayer. Bennett..... 2
116 The Sunday Question. Bennett..... 2
117 Constantine the Great. Preston..... 3
118 The Irrepressible Conflict between Christianity and Civilization. W. S. Bell..... 5
119 The New Faith. J. L. Stoddard..... 3
120 Liberty for Man, Woman, and Child. Ingersoll..... 5
121 Ingersoll's Review of his Reviewers..... 3
122 The Great Religions of the World. Bennett..... 10
123 Paine Vindicated. Ingersoll..... 10
124 Sinful Saints, etc. Bennett..... 10
125 German Liberalism. Mrs. Clara Neyman..... 2
126 Crimes and Cruelties of Christianity. Underwood..... 10
127 Tyndall on Man's Soul..... 5
128 Paine Glorified. Ingersoll..... 5
129 Who was Jesus Christ? W. E. Coleman..... 2
130 The Ethics of Religion. W. K. Clifford..... 5
131 Paine was Junius. W. H. Burr..... 3
132 My Religious Belief. Ella Gibson..... 1
133 The Authority of the Bible. Underwood..... 2
134 Talks with the Evangelists. Elmer Woodruff, M. D..... 5
135 Is there a Future Life? Bennett..... 3
136 Torquemada and the Inquisition. Bennett..... 3
137 Christian Love C. L. James..... 3
138 Science and the Bible. John Jasper..... 2
139 Massacre of St. Bartholomew. S. H. Preston..... 2
140 Astro-Theology. L. L. Dawson..... 3
141 Infidelity. H. W. Beecher..... 1
142 Sepher Toldoth Jeschu. Scholasticus..... 10

SCIENTIFIC SERIES.

1 Hereditary Transmission. Prof. Louis Elsberg, M. D..... 3
2 Evolution; from the Homogeneous to the Heterogeneous. Underwood..... 3
3 Darwinism. Underwood..... 5
4 Literature of the Insane. F. R. Marvin..... 5
5 Responsibility of Sex. Mrs. Sara B. Chase, M. D..... 5
6 Graduated Atmospheres. J. McCarroll..... 3
7 Death. Frederic R. Marvin, M. D..... 5
8 How do Marsupial Animals Propagate their kind? A. B. Bradford.. 5
9 The Unseen World. Prof. J. Fiske..... 10
10 The Evolution Theory—Huxley's Three Lectures..... 10
11 Is America the New World? L. L. Dawson..... 10
12 Evolution Teaches neither Atheism nor Materialism. R. S. Brigham.
13 Nibble at J. Fiske's Crumb for the Modern Symposium. W..... 5

TERMS.—On one dollars' worth, 10 per cent off; on two dollars' worth, 20 off; on five dollars' worth, 40 off; on ten dollars' worth 50 off.

THE "HOLY CROSS" SERIES.—ESSENTIALLY ANTI-PAPAL.

No. 1. The Priest in Absolution. Twenty-five cents.
No. 2. The Mother of Harlots: or, Popery Dissected. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.
No. 3. The Popes and their Doings; or, the Vicars of Christ and Vicegerents of God. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.
No. 8. Auricular Confession and Nunneries. By Wm. Hogan, for twenty-five years a confessing priest. Fifty cents. And several others.

The Truth Seeker Collection of Forms, Hymns and Songs.

Forms for the organization of Liberal Associations, Liberal Leagues, etc. Forms for Marriages, Funeral Services and various other purposes, with a full selection of original and selected Hymns and Songs for the use of Radicals, Spiritualists and Liberals of all classes to be used at public meetings, funerals, social gatherings, etc. Price 75 cts. Published by.

D. M. BENNETT,
141 Eighth Street, New York.

JOHN'S WAY.

A Pleasing Domestic Radical Story of a suggestive, instructive character, and well calculated to overthrow the superstitions and absurdities of the Church. By Mrs. ELMINA D. SLENKER, author of "Studying the Bible," etc. Thousands of copies of this little work should be placed in the hands of honest enquirers after truth. Price only 15 cts., $1.50 per dozen, or $10.00 per hundred.

D. M. BENNETT,
141 Eighth Street, New York.

Six Lectures on Astronomy.

Delivered in Steinway Hall, New York, by PROF. RICHARD A. PROCTOR. Price, 20 cents.

Eight Scientific Tracts.

125 pages. Price, 20 cents.

Theory of Evolution.

Three lectures by PROF. THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY. Delivered in Chickering Hall, New York. Price, 10 cents.

The Unseen World.

A popular and able treatise by PROF. JOHN FISKE. Price, 10 cents.

Is America the New World?

By L. L. DAWSON. A paper showing great research. Price, 10 cents.

UNDERWOOD-MARPLES DEBATE.

BETWEEN

B. F. UNDERWOOD, of Boston, Mass., Liberal Lecturer,

AND

REV. JOHN MARPLES, of Toronto, Ont., of the Presbyterian Church.

Held during four evenings in July, 1875, at Napanee, Ont.

Two propositions Discussed. *First*—"That Atheism, Materialism, and Modern Skepticism are illogical and contrary to reason." MARPLES affirming; UNDERWOOD denying. *Second*—"The Bible, consisting of the Old and New Testaments, evidences beyond all other books, its divine origin." MARPLES affirming; UNDERWOOD denying.

Reported in full by JOHN T. HAWKE, of the Toronto *Daily Leader*
Paper, 40 cents; leather, 75 cents.

D. M. BENNETT,
141 Eighth St., New York

THE TRUTH SEEKER,

A Weekly Journal of Progress and Reform;

DEVOTED TO

SCIENCE, MORALS, FREETHOUGHT AND HUMAN HAPPINESS.

D. M. BENNETT, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Believing there is nothing in the world so valuable as TRUTH, "THE TRUTH SEEKER" is earnest and constant in search of it, and hesitates not to fearlessly avow its honest convictions. It is outspoken in its condemnation of the errors and fallacies of the past, and in holding up in the light of the present era the theological dogmas and the blinding creeds of pagan superstition which had their origin thousands of years ago, in the primitive ages of our race.

"THE TRUTH SEEKER" was started as an eight-page Monthly, in Paris, Ill., in September, 1873. Four numbers were issued in that locality, when it was decided to remove it to New York, and to double its number of pages. With the beginning of its second volume, it became a Semi-Monthly, and the second volume was continued sixteen months, to the close of 1875, when it became a *Weekly* of eight pages. At the commencement of its fourth volume, in January, 1877, it will contain sixteen pages; steadily growing and increasing in popularity with its readers. It is believed "THE TRUTH SEEKER" is destined to become the recognized champion and mouth-piece of the rapidly growing Liberal and progressive element of the country.

Every lover of Truth; every person favorable to the fearless expression of honest opinion; every individual who wishes to spread broadcast the glad tidings of Right and Reason; every friend of mental liberty who desires that sectarianism, superstition, bigotry, and error shall retire to the rear, should subscribe for the valiant "TRUTH SEEKER," and induce as many others to do so as possible.

The friends of truth and progress can hardly be said to have discharged their full duty who do not lend their support to this meritorious publication.

Its very moderate terms places it within the reach of all. It is sent, post-paid,

Twelve Months for	$3 00
Six Months for	1 50
Three Months for	75

Sample copies sent upon application.

The names of all Liberal-minded people are solicited, who would be likely to appreciate a periodical of this character.

D. M. BENNETT, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,
Science Hall, 141 Eighth St., New York.